LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 19 1980
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX 9225 .C29 A35 1831
Campbell, John McLeod, 1800-
1872.
The whole proceedings before
the Presbytery of

THE

WHOLE PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE

PRESBYTERY OF DUMBARTON,

AND SYNOD OF GLASGOW AND AYR,

IN THE CASE OF THE

REV. JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL,

MINISTER OF ROW.

INCLUDING THE LIBEL, ANSWERS TO THE LIBEL,

EVIDENCE, AND SPEECHES.

NOTE TO THE READER

The paper in this volume is brittle or the inner margins are extremely narrow.

We have bound or rebound the volume utilizing the best means possible.

PLEASE HANDLE WITH CARE

GENERAL BOOKBINDING CO., CHESTERLAND, OHIO

PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF

THE REV. JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL.

THE intense interest so extensively awakened by the proceedings in the church courts, in the case of the Rev. J. M'Leod Campbell, minister of Row, together with the paramount importance of the case itself, obviously render it most desirable, that the church in general should be put in possession of a faithful record of *all* these proceedings.

The compiler of the following pages, has been induced to undertake this task, in consequence, chiefly, of being in a condition to state with accuracy, the facts in the history of the case previously to its becoming a matter of record; and of being able to add to the series of authentic documents, the substance of notes, taken in short hand, of most of the discussions connected with them, which have taken place in the inferior courts. Although the facts antecedent to the date of the earliest of these documents, are well known in the immediate vicinity of Row, they are,

PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF

THE REV. JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL.

THE intense interest so extensively awakened by the proceedings in the church courts, in the case of the Rev. J. M'Leod Campbell, minister of Row, together with the paramount importance of the case itself, obviously render it most desirable, that the church in general should be put in possession of a faithful record of *all* these proceedings.

The compiler of the following pages, has been induced to undertake this task, in consequence, chiefly, of being in a condition to state with accuracy, the facts in the history of the case previously to its becoming a matter of record; and of being able to add to the series of authentic documents, the substance of notes, taken in short hand, of most of the discussions connected with them, which have taken place in the inferior courts. Although the facts antecedent to the date of the earliest of these documents, are well known in the immediate vicinity of Row, they are,

however, comparatively little known at a distance; and it may not be unimportant to the cause of truth, to put all who feel an interest in the case, in possession of every particular necessary for coming to a dispassionate judgment on its merits.

Mr. Campbell was settled in the parish of Row, in Sept. 1825; but it was not until the summer of 1827, that any offence appeared to have been taken at the matter of his teaching. At that period the chief peculiarity of his sermons seemed to be the strong statements they contained on the assurance of faith, and the connexion that exists between man's belief in the testimony of God and his consciousness of being in the condition of having passed from death to life. The doctrine of the love of God to every man, as declared in the death of Christ for all, though evidently implied in his sermons, was seldom broadly or pointedly stated, and did not appear to have that prominency and importance in his mind, which it afterwards assumed.

Toward the close of the year 1828, it is believed in the month of December, the first attempt was made to bring the subject matter of Mr. Campbell's teaching under the consideration of the church courts. About this time, a petition, signed by a few individuals, was lodged with the presbytery of Dumbarton, in which a variety of charges were brought against Mr. C., and among others his having taught that there was no occasion for repentance—no such thing as a good hope through grace—that Christ was no lawgiver, &c. &c. After this petition was received by the Presbytery, and, it is believed, after part of it was taken down in the Minutes, it was discovered to bear

no date, an informality which made it necessary to return it to the petitioners.

In March, 1829, another petition of the same tenor, signed by three or four individuals (none of them of the number of those who subsequently brought forward the libel) was presented to the Presbytery. Only two of the petitioners appeared. Of these the name of one was struck off the petition, as it appeared that he had, for many years, been refused church privileges, and consequently could not be considered a member of the church. The other was prevailed upon, by one of Mr. Campbell's co-presbyters, to withdraw the petition for a time. This petition was never afterwards presented; nor did any of the same parties again appear before the Presbytery in any matter connected with this case.

On the 30th March, 1830, the following Memorial was presented to the Presbytery.

Memorial of the undersigned Heads of Families and others in communion with the Church of Row, to the Reverend the Presbytery of Dumbarton.

Your memorialists wish to remind your Reverend Presbytery of a petition presented to you about a year ago, signed by certain of our fellow parishioners, representing that certain unsound pernicious doctrines, contrary to Scripture and the Standards of the National Church, had, for some time, been constantly preached and taught in Row church and parish, by the Rev. John M. Campbell, minister of that parish.

Your memorialists had earnestly hoped that mature reflection during the twelve months for which it had been agreed in the Presbytery to defer the proceedings on the petition, would have led to a cure of the evil complained of. But not only have the original obnoxious tenets been inculcated by Mr. Campbell with increased earnestness ever since—it is with deep sorrow we say it—but a number of other "unprofitable questions" have been agitated, and doctrines, in

our opinion, even still more pernicious, have been introduced; for example, that of universal pardon. It must, indeed, be superfluous to urge on the notice of your Reverend Presbytery, what has become a matter of notoriety in the remote parts of the kingdom.

Your memorialists have been induced, though reluctantly, to recall your attention to this matter, in order that you may take measures for effectually checking that constantly increasing, most painful and pernicious state of discord into which the Parish has fallen; and for securing our youth from unavoidably falling into what we conceive to be hurtful errors.

Row, March 9th, 1830.

(Signed)

JOHN ORR.
GEORGE M'LELLAN.
PARLAN M'FARLAN.
ALEX. M'LEOD.
JOHN THOMSON.
A. LENNOX.
ALEX M'DOUGAL.
JAMES M'KINLAY, Jun.
PETER COCHRAN.
JAMES COCHRAN, Jun.
JOHN M'KINLAY.
PETER TURNER.

After this memorial was read, one of the members of Presbytery observed, that this was a very important and very delicate question; and that all would be sensible that the less that was said about it, in the present state of matters, the better.—That every person was fully aware of the evil complained of, and that he had no doubt something must be done for the parish; but that having a brother to deal with, some delicacy was necessary; and he would, therefore, propose, that a small committee be appointed to commune with Mr. Campbell, previous to any further step.

It being asked if all the memorialists were members of the church? One of the memorialists replied, "I am in communion with the church, and we have all an interest in this business. We have families rising up, and we must look to ourselves and our families. This is not a private thing, done in a corner: the ministers of the church, all around us, have taken it up. They have both written against these doctrines, and spoken against them from the pulpit, and have given them the name of 'Heresy.'"

Another memorial was then presented, signed by about 80 householders and heads of families of the parish of Row, to the following purport:—*

That the memorialists had recently learned, that a petition either had been, or was about to be presented to the Presbytery, complaining of Mr. Campbell, their minister, as teaching certain doctrines; and having learned that great eagerness had been manifested to get names to that petition, that they felt themselves called upon to testify their undiminished attachment to Mr. Campbell, as their pastor, and to state, that Mr. Campbell continued fervently, in season and out of season, to press on his people the necessity of believing the gospel, of resting on the Lord Jesus Christ alone for salvation, of departing from all iniquity, and living in the hope of a blessed immortality; and that these, his labours of love, had not been without much success; and they trusted that nothing would be done by the Presbytery to weaken the hands of so faithful a minister of the gospel.

This memorial in favour of Mr. Campbell, the Presbytery refused to receive, and ordered the other to be laid on the table. After some discussion, during which another course was proposed by some members,

* The Compiler, not being able to procure a copy of this Memorial has given the substance of it from the notes of the Reporter, who was present.

a committee of six was appointed, to converse with Mr. Campbell, *quam primum*, and report to the next meeting of Presbytery. Mr. Campbell objected to the appointment of a committee, at that stage of the proceedings, as altogether unconstitutional and incompetent; but was told that the Presbytery had already decided on pursuing that course, and could not re-consider the matter.

The following is the minute of the committee appointed to confer with Mr. Campbell, together with Mr. C.'s reasons for not conferring with the committee.

At the Ferry-of-Balloch Inn, the sixth day of April, 1830.

The Committee appointed to converse with Mr. Campbell met in consequence of notice from the Convener. Present, The Rev. Dr. Graham, Dr. Hamilton, Messrs. Proudfoot, Lochore, and Niven, with Mr. Campbell.

Dr. Graham in the Chair.

Mr. Lochore was chosen Clerk.

The extract minute of Presbytery, appointing this committee, was read.

Upon a question put by Mr. Campbell, as to the precise object of this meeting, the committee stated, that it was for the purpose of ascertaining Mr. Campbell's views of the doctrine and worship of this church.

It was further asked by Mr. Campbell, upon what ground do the committee conceive themselves appointed to converse with him on the above subjects.

The committee consider that an answer to this question is unnecessary, after reading the extract of the minute of presbytery, containing a memorial from certain heads of families, and others of the parish of Row—representing that unsound and pernicious doctrines had been preached in the church of Row, by Mr. Campbell.

The committee agree to throw their further procedure into the form of question and answer, and to take down as far as possible the *ipsissima verba*.

Mr. Campbell declined conversing with the committee for reasons which he gave in in writing, and requested should be engrossed in the minutes of the committee—which reasons, after mature deliberation, the committee refused to engross, in respect that the said reasons refer not to any act of the committee, but to an alleged irregularity on the part of the Presbytery, in the appointment of the committee. But they appoint the said reasons to be authenticated and transmitted along with this report.

The committee deeply regret this termination of their labours, as they had ardently hoped, that in the course of a free and brotherly conversation, some steps might have been taken towards an adjustmen of the differences between Mr. Campbell and some of his parishioners, and as they now fear that there is no room for any amicable arrangement.

(Signed) JOHN GRAHAM, Convener.

MR. CAMPBELL'S REASONS, &c.

"Mr. Campbell then stated, that while he felt the utmost respect for his brethren of the Presbytery, and for the committee, and had accordingly met with his brethren to-day, on having the meeting intimated to him, he still feels it his duty to himself, as a member of the church, and to his brethren in the church, whose rights may suffer in his person, to decline, in the particular circumstances of the case, to confer, on the subject above mentioned, with the committee, acting upon the above referred to ground—for the following reasons:

1mo. These circumstances in the nomination of the committee, induce Mr. C. thus to decline, viz., The memorial referred to having been presented, two measures were proposed. These occasioned some discussion, which occupied some time—at last, that which has occasioned the present meeting was adopted. When this took place, Mr. Campbell did not observe what was done, not from any inattention or indifference, but from long consulting the form of process in a church law authority—his view of which, he was speaking of to a co-presbyter near him, feeling it time enough to speak when the Presbytery had made a choice between the two measures before them, and taking for granted that *care would*

be taken that he should be aware of what was done, before any thing was finally fixed upon. When Mr. C.'s attention was drawn to the determination of the Presbytery, by a movement which indicated that they were going to another subject, and when he inquired what was the state of proceedings, he was told that the committee was appointed, and that it was final. Mr. Campbell then desired to object to the course adopted, and was told that it was too late; and this reply, while Mr. Campbell manifested a distinct anxiety that they would regard the matter as still open, and reconsider it, was still adhered to, although the sederunt was not yet closed. Mr. Campbell intended to state, had he been permitted, objections to the course adopted, which, he may presume, would have induced the Presbytery to change that course; but the opportunity not having been given, the impression on Mr. Campbell's mind was, that he would need to use all caution in regard to conferring with a committee, whose nomination had such a seal put to it. The result is, his present determination as to which he is desirous to have this reason for it recorded, being aware of the ungracious appearance of declining to confer with a committee of his brethren, on any subject, however informal he might conceive their nomination to be. If Mr. Campbell had first heard of the appointment through the communication of the convener, he might have been expected, in fairness, to have assumed that, though irregular, it was in *kindness* to him that the usual procedure was departed from; but in the circumstances detailed it was impossible for Mr. Campbell to have that conviction.

2ndo. This may explain why Mr. Campbell, in the second place, declines upon the ground that he is referred to a memorial still lying on the Presbytery's table, and not yet considered, as the ground of marking him out from among his brethren, and calling him to a distance from his own home, to be examined upon his views of the doctrine and worship of a church of which he is a minister—bound to faithfulness to its interests by the highest obligations—for the nomination of a Committee for such an object, is itself a judicial act, as Mr. Campbell understands the form of process.

3tio. Another consideration that weighs with Mr. Campbell is the rejection, without any notice even of its rejection, in the Presbytery's minute, of a memorial, or petition, numerously signed by his most respectable parishioners,

fitted to counteract the impression conveyed by that now on their table. These things Mr. Campbell begs to have stated, that he may not appear capricious or wayward, or disrespectful in declining to confer with his brethren; nor unnecessarily interfering with them in the discharge of their duties, as the guardians of religion; nor objecting to the legitimate use of the powers given them for that end—which he recognises, to which he has promised, and to which, in the strength of God, he hopes to be enabled to yield all due submission.

JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL."

At the next meeting of Presbytery, on the 4th May, the foregoing minute, or report, of the committee appointed to converse with Mr. Campbell, and also his reasons for not conferring with the committee, were given in and read; and, after some discussion, the report of the committee was approved of by a majority.

Mr. Dunlop of Keppoch, Elder from Cardross, then moved that the memorial presented at last meeting of Presbytery in favour of Mr. Campbell, which, he said, although numerously and respectably signed by the parishioners of Row, the Presbytery had most unaccountably rejected, while they had received a petition against him without the least inquiry into the character of the petitioners. This motion was, after some conversation, agreed to, and the memorial was received and read.

Mr. Dunlop then, at considerable length, contended that, according to the form of process, before considering an accusation against a minister, the characters of the persons bringing the accusation ought to be inquired into. And he considered it still more the bounden duty of the Presbytery to investigate this

point, because of the character of the man against whom the present accusation was directed—" a man," he said, " whose character the breath of scandal had never touched—one who had really imbibed the spirit and temper of his Divine Master—one who truly had that wisdom which is from above, which is pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits." He expressed his disapprobation of all the proceedings of the Presbytery in this case, and concluded with moving—" that seeing it is so important for the interests of religion that no charge be preferred lightly, or by improper, or incompetent, persons, against either the life or doctrine of a minis- of the Gospel, that before any proceedings take place in consequence of this memorial against Mr. Campbell, the religious knowledge, and life and conversation of the petitioners be inquired into, as enjoined in the form of process, and that for this purpose the whole of the petitioners be cited to appear at the bar at next ordinary meeting of Presbytery." This motion was seconded by the Rev. Mr. Story.

Dr. Hamilton of Strathblane—" I agree most cordially with the greater part of what Mr. Dunlop has said respecting Mr. Campbell. I esteem Mr. Campbell as one of the worthiest of men; but just in proportion to my veneration for his character, am I vexed that there should be any ground given for an accusation against him. Nothing would delight me more than that before we part to-day, he and the memorialists were cordially united—that any thing he may have advanced inconsistent with the Scriptures should be relinquished by him; and that if his opponents are

in any darkness respecting his tenets, they should be enlightened, and that his usefulness should not be obstructed by any proceedings in the church courts; and, perhaps, if we go about the matter in the spirit of meekness and love, wonders may yet be wrought."

He contended that Mr. Dunlop's motion could not be acceded to—that to inquire into the religious knowledge or character of the memorialists, was quite incompetent, seeing that they were in communion with the church, which fact, of itself, testified both as to their knowledge and character.

The motion was opposed on the same ground by several members of court, and was withdrawn for a time.

The memorialists against Mr. Campbell were then called to the bar, upon which three of them appeared, and stated that they adhered to their memorial; and being asked whether they appeared only for themselves or for themselves and the other memorialists, they answered that they had no authority from any of the others.

A lengthened discussion took place as to the propriety of putting some questions to these Memorialists, regarding the nature of the "unprofitable questions and obnoxious tenets" of which they complained, in order to ascertain whether or not they understood what they complained of, but this would not be permitted.

Mr. Campbell then stated, that, according to the constitution of the church, before a complaint can be preferred against a minister, those bringing the charge are bound to come and converse with their minister

upon the subject, and ask explanations. He stated that not one of the memorialists now in court had ever come to him, or had any communication with him on the subject. Two of the memorialists had had some conversation with him on the subject, but they were not present, and that was not a thing that one man could do for another. The form of process is very distinct on this subject,* and the principle of it is, that nothing is to be done which may tend to injure the character of a minister, without the greatest caution. That the duty of complainers to converse with their minister relative to the complaint they purposed to bring against him, was binding on each of them *individually*. It was not a matter that one could do by deputy, as it was a matter in which their consciences must be concerned, and not a mere matter of form—it was not like serving a notice, but it was in order that if their minister should be able to satisfy them, or to convince them that they were wrong, they should never bring forward the complaint.

* 3. And because a scandal committed by a minister hath on these accounts many aggravations, and once raised, though it may be found to be without any ground, yet it is not easily wiped of; therefore a presbytery should exactly *ponder by whose information and complaint it comes first before them;* and a presbytery is not so far to receive the information, as to proceed to the citation of a minister, or any way begin the process, until there be first some person, who under his hand gives in the complaint with some account of its probability, and undertakes to make out the libel.

4. All Christians ought to be so prudent and wary in accusing ministers of any censurable fault, as that they ought neither to publish nor spread the same, *nor accuse the minister before the presbytery without firs acquainting the minister himself* if they can have access thereto, and then, if need be, some of the most prudent of the ministers and elders of that presbytery, and their advice got in the affair.— *Form of Process*, chap. vii.

Dr. Graham and Dr. Hamilton contended that the purpose of this requirement was merely that the minister might have notice of their intention, so as not to be taken unawares, and that this had been fulfilled, inasmuch as Mr. Campbell had admitted that two of the memorialists had conversed with him on the subject; and Dr. G. made a motion, to the following purport:—"The Presbytery, after mature deliberation, find that said memorial contains a serious charge against Mr. Campbell, and resolve to ask the memorialists whether they are willing to convert their memorial into a libel, under all the pains thereof." This motion having been seconded, Mr. Dunlop made a motion to the following effect:—Seeing it is so important both for the interests of religion, and for the security of the reputation of the ministers of the Church, that no charge should be preferred lightly against the life or doctrine of a minister; that, previous to founding any further proceedings on the memorial now on the table, the petitioners be required to state, whether they have complied with the requirements of the fourth section of the seventh chapter of the Form of Process; and after they shall have answered in the affirmative, that their religious knowledge, and lives and conversation, as well as their preparedness to substantiate the libel, be diligently and strictly inquired into, as enjoined in the Form of Process; and that, for this purpose, the whole of them be cited to appear at this bar, next meeting of Presbytery.

Both motions having been put to the vote, Dr. Graham's motion was carried—seven voting for it, and two for Mr. Dunlop's.

From this resolution Mr. Dunlop dissented, and complained to the ensuing General Assembly, to which dissent and complaint Mr. Story adhered.

Before the case came to be heard in the Assembly, the complainers against the resolution of the Presbytery were informed, on consulting counsel, that their complaint was not good, as it would have been quite competent to have brought forward their motion *after* the Presbytery had put the question to the memorialists which they had resolved to put; and also, that, although the Form of Process was very explicit on the point, it was very doubtful whether it would not be held that the practice was different; and, therefore, it was resolved to withdraw the complaint.

At this sitting of the Assembly several members spoke at considerable length against Mr. Campbell, but as, at the time, it appeared to many scarcely fair or decorous to attack a person who was not properly before the Assembly, and who could not be permitted, at that stage of the proceedings, to say a word in his own defence, the compiler will simply give the minute of the General Assembly on the subject, as it appears in the following record of the next meeting of the Presbytery of Dumbarton.

At Dumbarton, the fifteenth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and thirty years, which day the Presbytery met and was duly constituted:

(*Inter alia.*) Dr. Graham produced an extract of the judgment of the General Assembly, in the appeal of Mr. Dunlop and others, relative to the case of Row, the tenor whereof follows, viz.:—

At Edinburgh, Wednesday, the twenty-sixth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and thirty years.

Session sixth,

Which day the General Assembly of the Church of Scot-

land had transmitted to them, by their Committee of Bills, petition from Alexander Dunlop, Esquire, and others, dissenters and complainers against a sentence of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, resolving to call to their bar certain parishioners of Row, preferring a complaint against Mr. Campbell, minister of that parish, as having preached certain unsound doctrines.

The minutes having been read, parties were called. Compeared Mr. Story, one of the complainers, with Henry Cockburn, Esquire, Advocate, as counsel for him and the other complainers, and also as counsel for certain parishioners, who had petitioned the Presbytery in favour of Mr. Campbell, their minister.

For the Presbytery, Dr. Graham, Dr. Hamilton, Dr. Fleming, and Mr. Coltart: and for the parishioners complaining against Mr. Campbell, George M'Lellan, Aulay Lennox, and Peter Turner, three of their number.

Mr. Cockburn, in name of the complainers, craved leave to withdraw the complaint: and the members appearing for the Presbytery, signified their willingness to acquiesce in this proposal, on certain conditions. After reasoning, the General Assembly unanimously grant permission to the complainers to withdraw their complaint—and considering the vital importance of the subject, and that the doctrines imputed to Mr. Campbell, in the memorial presented to the Presbytery, have been condemned by the General Assembly in seventeen hundred and twenty years, and are directly opposed to the word of God, and the standards of this Church, remit this case to the Presbytery of Dumbarton, with instructions that they receive any libel which may be presented to them by the petitioners from the parish of Row, or proceed otherwise in the investigation of the charges against Mr. Campbell as they shall deem just, and for edification, according to the rules of the Church, and that they carry on their proceedings till the cause is ripe for a final judgment, notwithstanding any appeal or complaint on preliminary points.

Parties having been called in, this judgment was intimated to them. Whereupon Dr. Graham, in name of the Presbytery, took instruments and craved extracts.

Extracted from the records of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by

(Signed), JOHN LEE, *Cl. Eccl. Scot.*

The Presbytery agreed to call the memorialists from the parish of Row to the bar.

Compeared, Messrs. Parlan M'Farlan, George M'Lellan, Peter Turner, John Thomson, James Cochran, Peter Cochran, and A. Lennox.

The memorialists were then asked, whether they were willing to convert their said memorial into a libel, which they declared they were willing to do.

The memorialists were also asked whether they had, previous to the presentation of their complaint, acquainted Mr. Campbell of their intention to complain to the Presbytery of his doctrine—when they declared that two of them, in the name of the rest, had waited on him for that purpose.

It was moved and seconded, that the Presbytery should hold a parochial visitation of the parish of Row, on Thursday the eighth day of July, at half-past eleven o'clock, and require the minister of the parish to preach at that time and place, on his ordinary text: and further, appoint the Moderator to preach there on Sabbath the twenty-seventh current, and intimate the same from the pulpit after forenoon's service, and summon the minister, heritors, elders, and heads of families, to attend the presbytery thereafter, and acquaint them with the state of that kirk and congregation in every point; and if any of them have certain knowledge of any thing amiss in their minister, that they do then acquaint the presbytery therewith:—which was unanimously agreed to.

At this meeting Mr. Campbell asked, whether at the visitation it would be open to inquire into the characters of the memorialists, and was told that no such inquiry could be entered upon, as they were all in full communion with the church of Row.

Agreeably to this resolution, the Presbytery held a parochial visitation in the church of Row; Mr. Campbell preached before the Presbytery, from Matthew v. 1—12, a sermon, which was afterwards published from a short-hand writer's notes.

The Presbytery meeting, on this occasion, was held

with closed doors; but we have reason to believe that the following account of what took place, extracted from the Greenock Advertiser of 23d July, is substantially correct.

The Presbytery was constituted in the session house; after which, a report of a Committee appointed at last meeting to search for precedents, as to the proper manner of conducting the visitation, was read and approved of. After this, several of the members asked Mr. Campbell how long he proposed to preach, as he must fix a time. He replied, he thought it would take three hours to give what he would feel it needful to say on the subject from which he was to preach. He was told that they would not hear him above an hour, and that if he would not limit himself to a reasonable time, they would instruct the Moderator to stop him. Mr. C. begged that he might not be limited; and said, that especially as they were to judge the sermon, he ought not to be hindered from bringing out his meaning fully to prevent misconception. To this it was replied, that they did not come there to judge of a sermon—that his preaching at that time was a mere matter of form, and that his case would be neither better nor worse for his sermon. After a good deal of discussion, it was agreed that the whole services should not, if possible, occupy more than two hours.

The Presbytery then proceeded to the church. After Mr. Campbell had concluded the service, the Moderator intimated from the pulpit that the Presbytery would adjourn to the session-house, and invited the elders and those who had signed the memorial against Mr. Campbell, to meet with them there.

Before either the elders or memorialists were admitted, the Presbytery proceeded to discuss the merits of the sermon they had just heard. Some objected, that the sermon ought not to be judged of at all, for having limited Mr. C. as to the time he was to occupy, no judgment, in fairness, could be passed upon it—we have learned, however, that the Presbytery, by a great majority, recorded their detestation and abhorrence of the doctrine contained in two sentences in the sermon, which we believe are to the following purport—"God loves every child of Adam with a love the measure of which is to

be seen in the agonies of Christ;" and that "the person who knows that Christ died for every child of Adam, is the person who is in the condition to say to every human being, Let there be peace with you, peace between you and your God."

The minister having been removed, the elders were first examined. Several of the memorialists were then called in, one after another, by name, and questioned as to the nature of the heretical doctrines of which they had complained in their minister. After the parties were removed, we understand that a motion to the following purport was carried by a great majority—that the Presbytery recommend the memorialists to convert their memorial into a libel, and present it, with a list of witnesses, at the ordinary meeting of the Presbytery in September.

Mr. Dunlop, of Keppoch, opposed the motion, in a speech of which we regret we can only give an outline.

He began by vindicating himself from a virulent attack which, he said, had been made on him at the last meeting of Presbytery, from which he was absent. He went on to say, that it had been asserted, that he had adopted the line of conduct he had pursued, in the case now before them, for the purpose of preventing inquiry or creating delay. He said that this was utterly false—that he only desired to see the inquiry conducted as gentlemen and Christians ought to conduct it—and that so far from being an enemy to inquiry, it would give him great satisfaction that parochial visitations should take place in every parish within the bounds of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr—and he expressed his conviction, that a tenth part of the pains that had been taken to get up the petition which had brought them together, would bring memorials from many of the parishes, and abundance of evidence, not only of most improper doctrine preached by many of the ministers, but of great impropriety in their tempers, lives, and conversation.

With respect to the recommendation proposed to be given to the memorialists—he remarked that they had at last meeting agreed to convert their memorial into a libel, under a *guarantee* from certain members of Presbytery, *that the libellers should not be permitted to get themselves into a scrape.* This he considered was a most extraordinary arrangement between judges and parties before them. He not only conceived that no man could honestly act both as ac-

cuser and judge, but that an honest judge could have no private communication with parties—urge them to bring forward a suit—advise them how to carry it on—or give them a guarantee against any bad consequences from their doing so. He asked, what would be said of a judge in the court of session, who would come into a district of the country, advise certain parties to bring an action before that court, assure them that they had only to bring an action, and they should have no farther trouble, and might be assured of success—or what would be thought of judges who, after an action was brought before their court, permitted private interviews, at their houses and elsewhere, with one of the parties, and gave them their assistance and advice as to the way of carrying on their action? Unquestionably such conduct would cause such an outcry in this country, that such judges must lose their seats on the bench. Mr. Dunlop then asked *whether any member of the Presbytery of Dumbarton* had come into the parish of Row, and had urged the parishioners to petition the Presbytery against their minister, assuring them that they had only to petition, and that the Presbytery would manage the business without giving them any farther trouble? He farther asked, whether there were not *several members* of Presbytery who, *after* the petition had come before them, had had private communication with the petitioners, advised them as to their proceedings, and even concocted along with them the proceedings of that day? He said, if any of them had acted in such a way, he must object to such persons sitting as judges in the case. He mentioned that he knew well how unpleasant it was to some of the members that he should be there. He said he knew well the attempt some of them had made to induce the session of Cardross not to send him there as their representative. He had no doubt the attempt would be repeated, and perhaps successfully; but, while he was there, he must raise his voice in the cause of truth and justice, and therefore could not vote for recommending a libel under such circumstances. No reply was made to Mr. Dunlop's speech, and the decision of the Presbytery having been intimated to the parties, the Presbytery dispersed about 9 o'clock, P.M.

At the next meeting of Presbytery, in the first

week of September, a libel, which will be found at a subsequent part of this volume, was accordingly brought forward by eight of the individuals who had subscribed the memorial which had given rise to the proceedings already recorded. The name of the short-hand writer employed to record these proceedings, having been included in the list of witnesses for proving the libel, he was not allowed to remain in the court, at this and some other meetings of the Presbytery, and in consequence of this, no account can be given of what passed at this meeting. We understand, however, that the resolution which the Presbytery came to, to receive and serve this libel on Mr. Campbell, was opposed by the Rev. Mr. Story of Roseneath; who contended that the libel was not sufficiently explicit, and that the terms in which this charge was couched, might be understood in a sense neither contrary to the Scriptures, nor the standards of the Church. All the other members of Presbytery who were present, took a different view of the libel; and Mr. Campbell, was accordingly summoned to appear before the Presbytery at their next meeting on the 21st September.

The following account of the meeting of Presbytery, on the 21st September, is taken from the notes of another short-hand writer who was present. At the meetings of the 22d September and 5th October, no short-hand writer was present, so that the minutes of Presbytery, which will appear at their proper place, contain all that can be given respecting these meetings.

The parties in this case having been called to the

bar, the libel was read, and then Mr. Campbell's written answers to the libel were also read. Mr. M'George, agent for the libellers, spoke nearly as follows :

" Mr. Campbell has made certain admissions of the minor proposition in the libel ; but before adverting to these, I must speak as to the relevancy, because I must first crave the judgment of the Presbytery on that point. And to this point I address myself with diffidence and anxiety, not on account of any difficulty in it, as it appears simple and clear, but on account of the novelty of my situation. This is a question of rare occurrence, solemn in its nature, and one that must excite very great reflection at all times. The defender is, I believe, a gentleman of unblemished life, of respectable talents, and of acknowledged zeal in the discharge of his ministerial functions. A prosecution against such a man for erroneous opinions, is a very delicate and responsible duty, but still it is a duty, and the very circumstances to which I allude, seem to render it more imperative. When error, Sir, is propagated with zeal, and rendered plausible by talents, and when there is no antidote in the party by whom it is promulgated, it then peculiarly tends to excite confusion and disorder in the Church ; and the truth of this remark is but too fully verified by the state of the parish of Row. My clients therefore would have disregarded the convictions of their consciences, had they not placed Mr. C. at your bar.

This is a question of libel against a minister of the established Church, for promulgating doctrines in opposition to the Sacred Scriptures and the Confession of Faith ; and the question for you to decide, is the relevancy of the libel. In establishing that point, I am not called upon at all, according to my conception, to enter on the wide field of Scripture controversy ; that this doctrine is at variance with Scripture, I shall take leave to hold as true, if it is at variance with the Confession of Faith. I do not apprehend that the Reverend Presbytery will permit the standards of the Church to be called in question by one of her ministers, as not in accordance with Scripture, or to be opposed by other authorities not recognised by the Church : to entertain such arguments

would be a dereliction of principle. As to the authority to which a minister of the Church of Scotland is subject, there can be no doubt; but before going farther, it may be well to set this matter at rest. When a minister is ordained, among other questions which must be answered by him is the following: "Do you sincerely own and believe the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith, approven by the General Assemblies of this Church, and ratified by law in the year 1690, to be founded upon the word of God? And do you acknowledge the same as the confession of your faith; and will you firmly and constantly adhere thereto, and, to the utmost of your power, assert, maintain, and defend the same, and the purity of worship as presently practised in this national Church, and asserted in the 15th Act of Assembly, 1707?" And by the same Act, such as after trial are approved of, are appointed to sign a formula in these terms, "I do hereby declare, that I do sincerely own and believe the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith, approven by the General Assemblies, of this national Church, and ratified by law in the year 1690, and frequently confirmed by diverse Acts of Parliament since that time, to be the truths of God. And I do own the same as the Confession of my Faith."

Now, Sir, in considering the relevancy of the libel against a minister, who, at his ordination answered these questions affirmatively, and subscribed this formula, I am persuaded that the Presbytery will consider any detailed reference to the Scriptures altogether unnecessary.

With the Confession of Faith the reverend members of this Court must be much better acquainted than I am; but as it will be expected, I shall take the liberty of quoting a few passages, in order to show that the doctrines alluded to in the libel are contrary to it. The doctrines charged as erroneous, are two; 1st, That of Universal Atonement and Pardon; and 2dly, That Assurance is of the Essence of Faith and necessary to Salvation. Regarding the first of these, the Confession of Faith, is extremely explicit; and though Mr. Campbell has quoted some of the passages, which I shall now read, *with comments*, I shall feel it unnecessary to *do so* before this Court.

Mr. M'George then read the following passages from the Confession of Faith: "Chap. iii. section 6th and 7th; chap.

vi. sect. 6th ; chap. viii. sect. 1st and 5th ; chap. x. sect. 1st; chap. xi. sect. 1st and 5th ; chap. xv. sect. 3d, 4th, and 6th. There is one fact charged in the libel which, in express terms, sets the doctrine of the Church of Scotland at nought ; part of the 7th count relating to the sermon preached at Row, on the 4th July, 1830. " And on the same occasion you said that the doctrine of the Church of Scotland tended to fatalism."

The second doctrine charged against Mr. Campbell is, that Assurance is of the Essence o fFaith, and necessary to salvation.

This point is likewise condemned in the Confession of Faith. (Mr. M'George then read) Chap. xiv. sect. 3d; chap. xviii. sect. 3d and 4th. Then, Sir, as to the Act of Assembly 1720, I should think it quite unnecessary to defend the authority of that Act on which Mr. C. has made various observations. It is considered as the authoritative declaration of the opinions of the Church of Scotland, and will undoubtedly be received with respect in this Presbytery. (Mr. M'G. then read the Act.) Now, Moderator, it is upon these express propositions of the Confession of Faith, and this judgment of the General Assembly, that I found the relevancy of the libel. I consider it unnecessary to detain the Court, and expect that the Presbytery will find the libel relevant. Mr. C., in his able defence, has acknowledged the minor proposition qualified in certain respects ; but the major proposition he has admitted in as many words. There are explanations given of the doctrine of universal pardon, but none of universal atonement ; I should therefore think that a proof from witnesses is unnecessary. If I understand the defence, it substantially admits the doctrines imputed to Mr. Campbell, but denies the relevancy of the charges ; but I am perhaps anticipating, for the first duty of the Presbytery is to consider whether the libel, if made out, is sufficient to infer the conclusion.

Mr. Campbell. I do not expect to add any thing of importance to what I have already stated ; but seeing that it resolves itself so entirely into a question of relevancy, I am very desirous that the ground on which I deny the relevancy be distinctly apprehended. I did not utter a syllable that had the least air of casting discredit on the Standards ; but

the Act of 1720, I regard with regret, and, as a minister of this Church, have cause to be humbled on account of it.

Mr. Campbell then shortly explained the grounds of his objections to the relevancy, in as far as they referred to the Standards, and the Act of the General Assembly of 1720. He said that had he been libelled for denying the doctrine of election, Mr. M'George's arguments would have been quite relevant against him; but, as he did not deny it, but on the contrary held it freely and fully, that he did not feel that they applied to him.

Mr. M'George then rose, and observed, that the authority of the Act of Assembly of 1720, could not, in the present case, be doubted, as the Assembly of 1830 had, in their remit to the Presbytery of Dumbarton, expressly referred to it; to which Mr. Campbell replied that, the principle of "an Act of any single Assembly not being a law of the Church" being applicable to them all, the remit of the Assembly of 1830 could not be regarded in any other light.

The Church-officer then, by the command of the Moderator, declared the parties to be removed from the bar.

The Moderator next called for any observations on the relevancy of the libel laid on the table.

The Rev. Dr. Graham, of Killearn, went at considerable length over the different doctrines libelled, and contended that they were contrary both to the Scriptures and the Standards; and concluded by moving that the Presbytery find the major proposition of the libel relevant.*

The Rev. Dr. Hamilton, of Strathblane.

"It is with great pain that I must now address you, in such a case as this; it would have been more delightful to have been co-operating with my brother. The defence he has made corroborates the statements of the counsel at the bar—he admits that he holds the doctrines in a certain sense. It is possible if you take detached sentences of Scripture to

* The Rev. Dr.'s speech is not reported here, because it was found on comparison, that it is, to a considerable extent, the same, word for word, with his speech at the bar of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, already printed, and given at a subsequent part of this record.

fasten on it any sentiments you please. If you read any book, and look at one part of it and not at other parts of it, any degree of nonsense may be found in it. Look at one part of the Bible, and it is said there, that the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God; look to another part and you will find it said, that the whole world lieth in wickedness; stop there, and the conclusion is irresistible that the whole world shall be turned into hell. But if I come to the Scriptures in a proper manner, I must renounce the doctrines my young brother has this day advanced. We must not go back to any confession before the Westminster Confession, for to it we must bow. By my subscription, I am bound to receive the Bible in the sense of the Westminster Confession. I am looking at the Confession used in the English church at Geneva, and here I see the language that was quoted 'to purge the sins of all the world; but when I look to another part of the same Confession, I find these words, 'to all them that believe.' This universal redemption, then, is limited to all them that believe. And, in another part, I find, "which Church is not seen to man's eye, but only known to God, who of the lost sonnes of Adam hath ordained some, as vessels of wrath, to damnation." If there is any difference between light and darkness, life and death, the man who holds the doctrine of reprobation, cannot hold the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon. Were there no other thing than this count in the libel, 'This doctrine of our Church leads to fatalism,' this would be sufficient to condemn the preacher. Our Standards maintain that Christ is the only Redeemer, but to say that for this reason all are pardoned, is just as absurd as saying, that because there is a road from Britain to France, therefore, all the inhabitants go to France.

Mr. Campbell's doctrine, regarding assurance, is at variance with our Standards, for he reprobates the idea of a man looking into himself for his interest in Christ. But I disdain all reference to the previous confessions to interpret our present one, which was received as being in nothing contrary to them: it holds that comfort is to be obtained from grace within us; and in the 80th, the 167th, and 172d questions of the Larger Catechism, we find the same doctrine, and, likewise, that our assurance increases as our holiness increases. This, I think, may be sufficient on the subject of

assurance; as to the tenet of universal redemption, I shall merely read to you the 59th question of the Larger Catechism, in addition to what has been stated at the bar.

(Dr. H. here entered into a minute consideration of the language of the Standards of the Church of Scotland, which he said was that of "offering salvation and grace to sinners;" in illustratation of this, he referred to the 67th and 68th questions of the Larger Catechism, and then proceeded as follows:)

I shall merely mention one passage more, the 32d question. I have many more marked, but with these I need not trouble you.

We find, through the whole of the sacred volume, if the Lord has a people, the serpent has one also; we find at the very opening of the sacred canon, there was enmity to be placed between the seed of the woman and that of the serpent; we trace this opposition through the whole of the Old Testament, and also through the New.

I hold in my hand a letter, in which a licentiate of this Church tendered his resignation. (Dr. H. then read the letter, in which it was stated, that the individual regarded the 6th section of the 3d chapter of the Confession of Faith, (in which it is stated, that none other are redeemed by Christ but the elect only,) as denying part of the truth of God, and that this appeared to him to be contrary to the plainest declarations of Scripture, in which it is said, that he died for all; and that, for this reason, he desired to tender his license to the Presbytery.) This individual, continued Dr. H. found it to be his duty to leave the Church on the very grounds on which our friend finds it to be his to remain. However unwilling I am, I must declare the libel relevant, and that we ought to take proper measures to establish the truth of the minor proposition."

The Rev. Mr. Gregor, of Bonhill.

"I will not find any great difficulty in stringing a few sentences together. I expected that Mr. Campbell would have wrought a very desirable reformation in the parish of Row. His talents are most respectable—of his zeal I never had a doubt: the last sermon I heard from him but one, I heard with great pleasure; there was a degree of talent and genius in it, which, in a sermon, is not misplaced. Our hearers are better judges of what we set before them than

we are aware of: they understand the subject as well as we do—they know when they are well served and ill served—but the last sermon I heard from him, I heard with pain; there was a degree of ingenuity in it, but it was applied to twist the word of God. Some of us might have been his father; and, without any great arrogance, I may say, that we had as much divinity as he has before he was born; and we may be allowed to have made some addition to it during the thirty years he has been in the world.

We are far from appealing to the word of God on this ground; it is by the Confession of Faith that we must stand; by it we hold our livings. I might just as well judge of any Act of Parliament, by the speeches made on both sides of the question, as proceed, as Mr. Campbell has done, in referring to the previous Confessions: as well might a minister refer to the decrees of the Council of Trent. If we can say, that Mr. Campbell's opinions are inconsistent with the Confession of Faith, we must come to a most painful and distressing conclusion; we must hold the doctrine libellous. Mr. Campbell has not to come and tell us now what the Bible says. When the Presbytery of Dumbarton inducted him into his living, he subscribed the Confession of Faith, with the most august ceremonies of religion; and the parish has a right to have the Scriptures interpreted according to the Confession of Faith. I have no doubt as to the course we ought to pursue, and conclude with finding the libel relevant."

The Rev. Mr. Proudfoot, of Arrochar.

"It will be necessary for me to make but a very few remarks. It is with very great pain that I rise on this occasion. I have had much intercourse with Mr. Campbell, and I regarded him as a dear brother in the Lord; but the tenets he now holds are inconsistent with the Confession of Faith, and with something still higher—that from which it derives its authority—the faithful record of the Amen. I, therefore, hold, that there is no difficulty at all; for I believe, that if any opinions are distinctly condemned by the Standards of our Church, these are of Mr. Campbell's. I have no hesitation in admitting, that assurance is what a believer may attain to; but I would tremble to say, that no man is a believer but he who has assurance at all times and in all cir-

cumstances. As to universal pardon, although I would not say that I would judge of a doctrine by the consequences of the doctrine, yet, from my own observation, I have been led to conclude, that it is tending to break down the defences of morality. I have, therefore, a duty which, as a minister, I must fearlessly discharge. I sit down, Sir, with pain, when I reflect on the time in which I have enjoyed hallowed and blissful intercourse with Mr. Campbell; but the doctrines he now holds are contrary to the Standards of the Church which I have sworn to uphold till the last breath of my existence. I have nothing further to say, but to conclude with finding the libel relevant."

The Rev. Mr. Story, of Roseneath.

"At last meeting, Sir, I dissented from the finding of the Reverend Court, on the ground, recorded in your minutes, that it did not contain specifically libellous matter. After hearing Mr. Campbell's explanations, I am still of the same opinion. The libel accuses Mr. Campbell of teaching doctrines contrary *to the Scriptures* and to the Standards; it will, therefore, not do to say, that we have nothing to do with the Scriptures; for I hold that it was, therefore, necessary for Mr. Campbell to prove, that his doctrines were consistent with Scripture. I have been surprised that none of the brethren have adverted to the candour with which he has treated the Presbytery. Instead of putting them to trouble, he has come forward and candidly confessed what he does hold. This should have drawn forth the warmest admiration. Of the nature of that defence, Sir, I was ignorant, until I heard it read this day; and, in justice to Mr. Campbell, I may add, there was not one word of it composed on Thursday last. Had I been his counsellor, I would not have given him such counsel as he has followed. Some of his parishioners have brought a charge against him; as a pastor, it became him to require a specific charge. I, for one, would have listened for hours, had you entered into the matter. I will, therefore, claim what I would willingly have granted to another; for, to say little is to say nothing.

The fundamental question is, does God hate or love his creatures. A reverend father, well qualified to speak on this subject, alluded to the subject of reprobation. Is this

decisive of God hating his creatures? If so, then I hesitate not to say, that I would renounce the Standards as contrary to the gospel. I say that it is contrary to all natural religion, to say that the infinite mind hates any of its creatures. The question is, has God expressed his love to all his creatures? Is there a man, woman, or child to whom God has not exhibited some kindness? Is there a man here who could venture to say, that there has existed a being to whom God has not shown some kindness? The question then is, what is the kindness God is ever manifesting? And I adopt Dr. Graham's rule of interpretation, that Scripture cannot contradict itself. 'If God endured with much long-suffering, the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction.' Did these vessels of wrath never experience his kindness? I hold that no sinner has a right to exist in the universe of God;—I hold that Adam, the moment he sinned, did not merit a moment's existence; why, then, was he permitted to exist, but in virtue of the mediation of Christ? There must, then, be some connexion between Adam and the whole human race—in his body were contained the elements of all future generations; I say more, I say that in him was contained that which entered into the constitution of our Lord's humanity; there, then, is a fundamental point. The question to which I am speaking is not, are all men pardoned? but is there any man, woman, or child, that has no connexion with Christ? Is there any one that has *merited* kindness from God? most unquestionably not. The only channel, then, through which such kindness could flow, is through Christ. I beseech you to observe, that the very existence of Adam, after sinning, depended on the fact that the Son of God should die in his nature.

As it is late, I must refer but shortly to the Standards. If Adam had been dealt with according to his iniquities, what would he have met with? He would have met with no kindness from God. Now, it is a first principle that the Holy Spirit holds communication with the sons of men only through the work of the Lord Jesus Christ; and if his work be limited to the elect, there could be no communication between the Holy Spirit and the non-elect. Now, the Confession is quite explicit on this point, that there are influences of the Spirit exerted on those that are non-elect. (Chap. x. 4.)

Now, you will observe, that I hold this principle described in this portion of the Confession to be identical with the truth that our Saviour has a connexion with all men who have descended from Adam—call it atonement, call it pardon, call it any thing. I will never cease to teach what I know many around me teach, that there is a connexion between every man and Christ; I hold that the very same blood which flows in the veins of the most reprobate—(Mr. Story was here interrupted by the Moderator)—what I mean to say is, that there is a connexion between Christ and every person of Adam's race, which does not exist between him and other races of beings. It must be seen, therefore, that in the explanation given of what Mr. Campbell teaches, I hold that there is nothing contrary to the principles I have laid down, or to the Confession of Faith, which I am ready to declare to be the confession of my faith; for in it you have certainly no contradiction of these principles.

But with regard to the other point libelled, in the major proposition; there is in the libel obviously a misconception as to the assurance of faith. The distinction drawn in the answers to the libel, and in the Confession, is most distinctly that there is a difference between the assurance of faith and the assurance of personal salvation. Mr. C. declared this last to be not so of the essence of faith as to be ever present with the believer, but that an assurance of the object of faith is essential to faith. Now, I hold that this is the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, and of all who are regarded as of authority in these matters. For example, the words of Patrick Hamilton, the martyr, are, "They that believe not that their sins are forgiven them for Christ's sake they believe not the gospel." This is strongly recommended by John Knox, who is the channel of its communication to the Church.

"My sure belief that God both may and will save me" is the answer to the question, What is faith, in Melville's Catechism.

What is the right faith? "It is a *sure persuasion* and stedfast knowledge of God's tender love toward us," &c. Calvin's Catech., Quest. 111th. "A sure persuasion of the heart, that Christ by his death hath taken away our sins," is the answer given to the same question in Davidson's Cate-

chism, which was approved of by an Assembly of this Church.

As to the Act of 1720, it is contrary to the constitution of the Church that such an Act should have a power that no other Act of Assembly had. In proof of this I may refer to the opinion of the very highest authorities of the Church on this point, (Mr. Story then quoted the language of Dr. Thomson, Dr. Burns, and of Boston on this subject, who all condemned the Act; which he said they could not have done had it been a law of the Church.)

Seeing, then, that there does exist a connexion between Christ and the children of men previous to their believing,—"for God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us"—this connexion then must have existed anterior to our believing; there is nothing therefore contained in this charge contrary to any fundamental principle of religion, or to our Standards; seeing that this is the principle laid down in these answers, and also that a man must be assured of what God says, I would, on sitting down, entreat of this house, before coming to any resolution, to investigate the matter more thoroughly.

The Rev. Mr. Sym, of New Kilpatrick.

Every court of judgment must have a law according to which its judgments are pronounced; and the Confession of Faith, according to which I am a minister of this Church, gives me an interpretation of that law. The Church has bound me down to a particular interpretation of the Confession, for I hold that the Act of 1720 is still binding on us here, after all that has been said; and the remit from the Assembly, 1830, prevents me from going beyond the simple ground that the doctrine of universal pardon, and that assurance is of the essence of faith, are contrary to the Standards. Mr. Story might surely have had more knowledge of church matters than to endeavour to do away with the force of the Act of 1720. He must surely have known the distinction between Acts declaratory and Acts legislative.

In the case of an Act declaratory, it is not essential that it be transmitted to Presbyteries; that of 1720 is of this description, and the ground therefore remains quite unshaken, that this doctrine is contrary to our Standards. It is unnecessary to detain you at this late hour, I beg merely

to say, that on hearing this libel read over, and comparing the major with the minor proposition, and again on hearing Mr. Campbell declare that he believed in and taught the doctrine of universal pardon, and that of assurance of faith being necessary to salvation; on hearing all this I believe that there will be no difficulty in our finding the relevancy of the libel; and I conceive that we have nothing to do but to take this voluminous document (the answers) into our serious consideration, and that there will be no occasion for bringing any witnesses here.

The Rev. Mr. Niven, of Balfron, made a number of objections to the libel, in point of form, and, after stating these at some length, proposed that they should remit the case to the Assembly as it then stood, as Mr. Campbell, in his defence, had confessed that he held opinions which, in Mr. N.'s estimation were contrary to the Standards of the Church, and were even worse than any thing in the libel.

The Rev. Dr. Fleming, of Old Kilpatrick, observed, that of the three kinds of acts in the Church, two did not require the approbation of a majority of Presbyteries, which was necessary only in the case of statute acts, to which class that of 1720 did not belong; and he maintained, that for this reason that act had the force of a law. Besides he affirmed that the subject of this act had been the result of mature deliberation, and had been before the Church for many years previously; on this ground he found the libel relevant.

Alex. Dunlop, Esq., elder from Cardross, was of opinion that the doctrines of Mr. Campbell, as explained in his answers, were neither contrary to Scripture, nor to the Confession of Faith, and therefore he held the libel not to be relevant.

After a few observations from another of the elders, the question was put by the Moderator—"Is the libel relevant or irrelevant?" when all the members voted "relevant," with the exception of the Rev. Mr. Story and Mr. Dunlop; against which decision Mr. Campbell entered his protest.

Of the meetings of Presbytery on the 22d September, 5th October, and 7th December, we are, at present, unable to give any account beyond what appears in the Presbytery record; extracts from which will be found after the libel and answers. An abridged account of the proceedings at the meeting of Presbytery, on the 29th March, 1831, will be given as an appendix to the proceedings in the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, the short-hand writer's report of it not having been received in time to admit of its being given at its proper place.

The Compiler cannot but regret the disjointed and irregular appearance which this volume must have, partly in consequence of the hurried manner in which it was necessary that it should be got up, but chiefly on account of the peculiar circumstances (which it is unnecessary to detail) under which those parts of it, extracted from the Presbytery record, had to be printed. He trusts, however, that he has been enabled (as he is sure it has been his earnest desire) to give a fair and impartial account of all the proceedings in this important case, up to the reference to the Assembly by the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr; and he hopes to complete this record by giving, as soon as possible after the sitting of the ensuing General Assembly, as a supplement to this volume, a full and accurate report of all the proceedings in this case before that venerable body.

If any shall be led by the perusal of this record to consider more seriously and prayerfully, than they ever yet have done, what is the truth of God—if, by the perusal of these discussions, any be shaken out of

their confidence in the opinions of men, and be made to search the Scriptures of truth, to find out for themselves "what they are to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man," the Compiler will consider himself abundantly rewarded for his labour.

Greenock, 14th May, 1831.

LIBEL, &c.

Mr John Macleod Campbell, Minister of the Gospel at Row, You are indicted and accused this seventh day of September, eighteen hundred and thirty, by the subscribers, heads of families, and inhabitants of the said parish, That albeit the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, as also the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, are contrary to the Holy Scriptures and to the Confession of Faith approven by the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, and ratified by law in the year sixteen hundred and ninety; and were moreover condemned by the fifth Act of the General Assembly held in the year seventeen hundred and twenty, as being directly opposed to the word of God, and to the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Church of Scotland: Yet true it is and of verity, that you the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell hold and have repeatedly promulgated and expressed the foresaid doctrines from the pulpit or other place or places from which you delivered discourses, as also in conversation, in your addresses to communicants at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and in your ministerial visitations of families within your parish: In so far as on various occasions during the course of the last twelve months, you the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell have declared that God has forgiven the sins of all mankind whether they believe it or not: That in consequence of the death of Christ, the sins

of every individual of the human race are forgiven: That it is sinful and absurd to pray for an interest in Christ, because all mankind have an interest in Christ already: And that no man is a Christian unless he is positively assured of his own salvation: And more particularly:

First, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in a sermon preached by you in the Floating Chapel at Greenock on the twenty-eighth day of April, eighteen hundred and thirty, or on one or other of the days of that month or of March immediately preceding, or May immediately following, used the following expressions, or at least expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet:* "Before I can say to any man fear God and give him glory, I must know that his condemnation is taken away, and his sins forgiven;" And again, "It is a fact at this moment of every person present that his sins are put away, and if I did not know this, I could not say to you fear God and give him glory, because it would be an impossibility:" And again, "I could not conceive any thing I could ask of God which he has not told me that he has already given me:" And again, "Christ's right to judge men is that he has redeemed them:" And again, "Judgment pre-supposes our forgiveness." And again, "It is as persons who have been forgiven that we shall be judged:" And again, "We cannot repent and give God glory unless we now have forgiveness:" And again, "There could be no judgment to come, unless there had been pardon to come."

Secondly, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell in a sermon preached by you at Row, on the eighth day of July eighteen hundred and thirty, in presence of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, being the day on which the said Presbytery held a parochial visitation of the parish of Row, or on one or other of the days of that month, or of June immediately preceding, or of August immediately following, used the following expressions, or at least expressions of a similar

import and tendency, *videlicet*, "That he alone bore the character of peace-maker who knew that Christ died for every human being:" And again, in speaking of the love of God, you said, "That that love to every individual of Adam's family was equal or according to the agonies of the Son of God:" And again, in speaking of the words in the fifth chapter of Matthew's Gospel, "Blessed are they that mourn," you said, "that the causes of this mourning were not within the believer, his sins having been taken away, but they existed outwardly in the unbelief and sinfulness of the world."

Thirdly, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in a Sermon preached by you in the School-house at Helensburgh, on one of the days of the month of October eighteen hundred and twenty-nine, used the following expression or expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet*: "That it was a gross error in the modern preachers of evangelical doctrines to maintain that the reason why men were not cured was that they did not seek an interest in Christ or come to him, because according to his idea an interest in Christ was the privilege of all men indiscriminately, and that the reason why men were not happy in the enjoyment of it was, that they would not allow themselves to be persuaded that they were continually in a state of reconciliation:" And again, "That the only cause why a man should at any time be sorrowful, was regret or dissatisfaction at himself, for not believing himself to be in a state of favour with God:" And again, "That by the death of Christ, all mankind were put into a state of pardon, or in that state in which God was not imputing their sins to them, and that the continued belief of this fact was all that was necessary to constitute the faith of the gospel."

Fourthly, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in the sermon preached by you as aforesaid on the eighth day of July eighteen hundred and thirty, in presence of the

Presbytery of Dumbarton, being the day on which the Presbytery held a parochial visitation of the parish of Row, or on one or other of the days of that month, or of June immediately preceding, or of August immediately following, used the following expressions, or at least expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet*, " That it was an indispensable feature in the character of a Christian, that he should know that God has had mercy on him, and has forgiven him."

Fifthly, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell in the sermon preached by you as aforesaid, in the school-house at Helensburgh, on one of the days of the month of October eighteen hundred and twenty-nine, used the following expressions, or expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet*, " That men allowing themselves to remain in doubt with respect to the simple fact of their having been individually restored to a state of favour with God, was the cause of all their misery, and that this was really the unbelief which the gospel condemns, it was giving the lie to God."

Sixthly, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell at the dispensation of the Lord's Supper at Row, in the month of July eighteen hundred and thirty, in fencing the tables, debarred from the Lord's Supper, " all who had not a personal assurance of their own salvation."

Seventhly, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in a sermon preached by you in the parish church of Row, on the fourth day of July eighteen hundred and thirty, or on one or other of the days of that month, or of June immediately preceding, or August immediately following, used the following expressions, or expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet*, " All men are both under the curse and under grace at the same time :" And on the same occasion, you said that the doctrine of the Church of Scotland regarding election " tended to fatalism."

Eighthly, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, at a parochial examination at Easterton, in the parish of Row, in the autumn of eighteen hundred and twenty-nine, when explaining the nature of faith from the question in the Shorter Catechism, "What is faith in Jesus Christ," observed, "That none could receive and rest upon Christ for salvation, who had not an assurance of their own salvation;" or words to that effect.

Ninthly, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in a sermon preached by you at Row on the fourth day of July eighteen hundred and thirty, or on one or other of the days of that month, or of June immediately preceding, or August immediately following, used the following expressions, or expressions of a similar import and tendency, *videlicet*, "That every man is in this state, that while he has in him death in Adam, he has life given him by Christ,"—"That the curse in Adam extended only to the death of the body, and takes effect upon all—the blessing of life in Christ is co-extensive with the curse, and belongs to all upon whom the curse has passed—that if Christ had not died, mankind would not have risen, nor would they have gone to hell to eternal punishment, but to Hades."

Tenthly, You the said Mr John M'Leod Campbell, in the sermon preached by you as aforesaid, in the Floating Chapel at Greenock, on the said twenty-eighth day of April eighteen hundred and thirty, or on one or other of the days of that month, or of March immediately preceding, or May immediately following, used the following expressions, or expressions of a similar import or tendency, *videlicet*, "Now, inasmuch as it is true concerning you, that in the first place, the work of God in Christ has put away your sins, so that it is the fact, that your sins are at this moment not imputed to you—inasmuch as it is true, in the second place, that the character of God, the real name of God, what he truly is, is revealed in this very work of God in

Christ, so that no person can see that work and be ignorant of God;—and inasmuch as it is true, in the third place, that Christ has the Holy Ghost for you, that in the Spirit you may behold and enter into and dwell in the light of God's glory in the face of Jesus Christ; inasmuch as these things are true, you observe, that sinners as you are, that deserving of condemnation, and by nature under condemnation as you are, that notwithstanding all the evil of your circumstances as these have arisen from the fall; your new circumstances which have arisen from the work of God in Christ, are such that it is perfectly reasonable to say to you, 'fear God and give him glory.' You are actually in a condition to meet this demand; you are precisely in circumstances in which to receive this command; there is no one thing you can name that creates the least obstacle, why you should not at this moment 'fear God and give him glory:'" And again, "Now let me not be misunderstood, I am not saying that God has no right to judge his creatures, I am not saying that the judgment recorded 'in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,' is not a righteous judgment. But this I say, that the principle upon which Christ judges the earth, is that Christ has redeemed us.—Not that the judgment suspends the pardon—not that the judgment makes the pardon conditional—not that it makes it uncertain till the judgment is come;—but that the judgment pre-supposes our forgiveness, that it has a reference to our forgiveness, that it is as those who have been forgiven that we judged shall be:" And again, "If we look at the actual condition of men, we would say, here is the darkness of total ignorance of the mercy that is in God—of the might that is in God for us.—Here are people who do not know that Christ died for them—who do not know that Christ has the Spirit for them—who do not know that the Bible says that their sins are remitted—here are people who conceive that they are giving God

glory in saying there is no proof of these facts. This is the real darkness in which men are living." All which or part thereof being found proved by the said Reverend Presbytery of Dumbarton, before which your Case is to be heard, it ought to be found and declared that you are unfit and unworthy to remain a minister of the Church of Scotland; and you ought to be forthwith deposed from the office of the holy ministry, and from the pastoral charge of the said church and parish of Row, and the said church ought to be declared vacant. According to the Laws of the Church of Scotland, and the usage observed in the like cases.

(Signed)
George M'Lellan, Farmer, Bolernick.
Peter Turner, Farmer, Bolernick.
A. Lennox, Surgeon, Helensburgh.
Alex. M'Dougal, Grocer, Row.
John M'Kinlay, Greenfield, Row.
John Thomson, Spirit-dealer, Helensburgh.
Parlan M'Farlane, Farmer, Farlane.
Alex. M'Leod, Feuar, Helensburgh.

List of Witnesses to be adduced for proving the foregoing Libel.

Reverend Patrick Brewster, one of the Ministers of the Abbey Parish of Paisley.
Peter M'Leod, Clothier in Helensburgh.
Robert M'Farlane, Farmer in Greenfield, lying between the Parish Church of Row and Gare-Loch head.
John M'Farlane, Feuar in Helensburgh.
Peter Bain, Teacher at Gare-Loch head, near Helensburgh.

James Bain, Student of Divinity, residing in Easterton, near Helensburgh.
James Brown, Parochial Teacher in Row.
Reverend William Cunningham, residing in Greenock.
Frederick Hope Pattison, sometime residing in Glasgow, now in Helensburgh.
Archibald Patterson, sometime manufacturer in Glasgow, now residing in Helensburgh.
Reverend John Arthur, residing in Helensburgh.
Reverend Robert Crawford, assistant to the Reverend Mr Archibald Wilson, Minister of Cardross.
Reverend Doctor Robert Burns, one of the Ministers of Paisley.
Alexander Munro, now or lately Tutor in the family of Lord John Campbell, Ardincaple House, near Helensburgh.
William Stewart, Surgeon in Glasgow.
Robert Baillie Lusk, Bookseller in Greenock.
James Dunn, Anchorage Office in Greenock.

(Signed)
George M'Lellan, Farmer, Bolernick.
Peter Turner, Farmer. Bolernick.
A. Lennox, Surgeon, Helensburgh.
Alex. M'Dougal, Grocer, Row.
John M'Kinlay, Greenfield, Row.
John Thomson, Spirit-dealer, Helensburgh.
Parlan M'Farlane, Farmer, Farlane.
Alex. M'Leod, Feuar, Helensburgh.

Which Libel the Presbytery having duly considered, did and hereby do, agreeably to the Form of Process, appoint the Clerk to make out a complete extract thereof, to be served upon said Mr John M'Leod Campbell:—and further appoint the Presbytery Officer to go to the Manse of Row and serve the same upon Mr Campbell, or leave it at

his dwelling-house, together with the List of Witnesses and a Copy of the Productions in aid of Proof, on or before Friday the tenth current, and summon him to appear before the Presbytery at their next Meeting, on Tuesday, the twenty-first current, at twelve o'clock noon.. And the Officer is to return to the Presbytery on that day an Execution of the said Summons, signed by himself and two witnesses to the delivery thereof.

Extracted from the Records of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, on this and the preceding twenty-two pages, by

WILLIAM JAFFRAY, *Pby. Clk*

ANSWERS

FOR THE

Rev. J. M'L. CAMPBELL, Minister of Row.

TO

The LIBEL at the instance of George M'Lellan, Peter Turner, A. Lennox, Alexander M'Dougall, John MacKinlay, John Thomson, Parlan M'Farlane, and Alexander M'Leod, designing themselves heads of families and inhabitants of the Parish of Row.

I now stand libelled by some of my parishioners before my Presbytery; a situation which for some time I have in a measure anticipated, while I have felt it my duty as long as it might be to shun it. I have not courted, what may be called, legal investigation into the manner in which I have discharged the duty of a teacher in the church of Christ. However much I have felt the desirableness, in one view, of escaping the misconception to which it exposed me; it is in the knowledge of the Presbytery, that so long as I did not find myself *obliged* to take the place of an accused person, and to submit to judicial inquiry into the doctrines which I hold and teach, I have avoided doing so. I have acted thus under the conviction that it was not the will of God that I should be made to turn aside from the straightforward path of duty, in testifying to truth, both in the public ministry of the Word and otherwise, by adopting any step which was commended simply by considerations of regard to my own character and estimation, in the judgment of those who would not discriminate between an impatience under the feeling of *appearing* to shrink from

the avowal of opinions held, and true faithfulness. There is always enough of light to afford those who will take the trouble to inquire, abundant opportunity of applying the rule of our Lord, "By their fruits ye shall know them." And the person who is content to go on testifying to the truth of God, and who refuses to be tempted of Satan, to lay aside the work of commending the love of Christ to men, for that of defending himself from their attacks, will feel in the dying away successively, of the successive misrepresentations to which he has been exposed, a commendation of the wisdom of having patiently borne with them, and proceeded with his Master's work.

I say this much with reference to the past, because know it has been thought that I ought to have courted investigation, when the charge of heresy had become associated with my name. I have felt that I had something else to do, than defend myself;—and, as to the *interests of the truth*, I have felt that it was not in the form of an exculpation of myself that I was to preach Christ crucified,—yet God may use what may be so regarded (but what I desire to see with a feeling in no respect personal) for his own glory in the Gospel; and therefore have I occupied a moment in explaining the principle of my past conduct, desiring thereby to remove any prejudice which any misapprehension of it might awaken in considering my present defence.

And now that the time is come for answering judicially to the question, What do I teach and preach? and now that a libel against me is presented to my Presbytery, and that they are called upon to put to me the question, Are these charges just? I assure my Brethren, that it is my earnest and single desire to put them in possession of the *facts* in this matter. *I* shall not put any party to the trouble of proving what I know to be true, while, on the other hand, I have confidence in God, that any thing which

I am not prepared to recognise as true, I shall be enabled to disprove.

I feel that I am placed under some disadvantage by the indefiniteness of the statements in the major proposition of the libel; not that I cannot attach definite ideas to the words used, but that in the discussions on these subjects which I have heard and read, I know that they have been employed with a meaning different from that which I attach to them; and to give to the doctrines there denounced an acknowledgment, without explanation, would be to run the risk of seeming to hold what I detest and abhor. I also feel that there is some cause of complaint in that while certain doctrines are stated to be contrary to the Scriptures and the Standards of the Church, there is no specification of the passages, either in the Scriptures, or in the Standards, which are held to contradict them.

I do not, however, found upon these things. But before proceeding to the direct reply to the charges against my teaching, now preferred, this may be the proper time for directing the attention of my brethren to the unconstitutional use which is made in the libel of an Act of Assembly. In the major proposition, the Act of 1720, on the subject of the Marrow of Modern Divinity, is referred to, as if it were part and parcel of the constitutional law of the church, and to be taken as fixing an interpretation of the standards. The Presbytery are aware, that by the Act of Assembly 1697, Session 6, entitled, "An act anent the method of passing acts of Assembly of *General Concern* to the Church, and for preventing of Innovations," commonly called the *Barrier Act*, it is provided, "That before any General Assembly of this Church shall pass any acts which are to be *binding rules and constitutions* to the church, the same acts be first proposed as overtures to the Assembly, and being by them passed as such, be remitted to the consideration of the several Presbyteries of this church, and their opinions and consent reported

by their Commissioners to the next General Assembly following, who may then pass the same in Acts, *if the more general opinion of the Church thus had agreed thereunto.*"* Acts of Assembly that have not this history, therefore, are *not Laws* of the Church, but simply decisions upon the law, and bear the same relation to the law, that a decision of a court of law bears to any act of the Legislature; and therefore such Acts of an Assembly no more control following Assemblies, or any other church court acting in a judicial capacity, than the decisions of one judge control another judge in his application of statute law. I do not mean to make light of an Act of the General Assembly of the Church. The responsibility of the Church in respect of her General Assemblies is great, and when they are rightly guided, the Church has great cause of thankfulness; and when it is otherwise, great cause of humiliation; and causes of humiliation the Acts of Assemblies may often be; but in these cases there is great reason to rejoice, that by the Barrier Act already quoted, the Church, while she ought to confess them as sin, is not bound by them, but is free even to testify against them, either in her courts, or by the lips and writings of individual members. The Act of Assembly 1720, founded on in the libel, did certainly appear to some of the most holy and honoured ministers of that time, an act of the description which called for such a testimony, and they have borne it. And not unfrequently since, have ministers of the church united their testimony to that of these men; esteeming it an honour to be associated with persons whom they regarded as shining lights, in a period of much darkness; and it is a cause of thankfulness that such testimonies exist. And if there were any doubt as to the liberty enjoyed by the members of the Church to disclaim the authority of that Act as a binding law, the toleration of such testimonies would be enough to establish it. But if indeed there is any case in

* Act of Assembly, 1697, Session 6.

which the strict application of the Barrier Act is of peculiar importance, it is in a question of doctrine. It might be of little moment whether the temporary impression made upon a particular Assembly of her ministers, bound the Church as to a question of union of offices, or relating to the period of attendance of her students at Universities, though in such matters it is unquestionable that no Act of Assembly could change the order that now holds; but it would be a matter of very awful importance, if it were possible that an interpretation of her standards, commended, it might be, by the eloquence or ingenuity of an individual member of Assembly, and carrying for the time the minds of the majority along with it, should fix their meaning for the time to come; and become in fact itself the Church's authorized creed. It cannot be denied that an interpretation so adopted might possibly be a false one, and in that case, to give it authority would be to change the standard altogether. But no Assembly has power to fix an interpretation on the standards, any more than it has power to change them. Each Assembly acting in its judicial and executive capacity, will come to decisions, and carry them into effect, according to its own views of the Church's Laws;—and those whose interests may be affected are bound to submit, but while submitting, as there is no appeal, they may still protest; and any minority, not agreeing in the judgment of the Assembly, may dissent; and such protest and such dissent, will go down to the future as a testimony demanding the sympathy of the Church: and such sympathy it may receive, and such sympathy may be expressed even in Acts of subsequent Assemblies, contradictory to the decision complained of. This shows clearly in what light the General Assemblies' interpretations of the Church's Law are to be regarded. If they were in any sense an authoritative fixing of the Law itself, no such protests or dissents could be received; neither could dissent be avowed without exposing the person avowing it to extrusion from the Church.

My Brethren, therefore, will feel that they come unfettered by the judgment of the Assembly referred to, to the consideration of this subject; and whether they shall see cause to interpret the standards of the church, as that Assembly have done or not, at least that there is neither any obligation upon them to bow to it as authority, nor right to found upon it in their sentence, nor liberty to feel delivered by it from the responsibility of weighing the matter for themselves.

I trust, however, that the Presbytery shall be enabled to see the matter in another light; and if the present discussions be overruled to leading the church to improve the opportunity which they afford of wiping away the stain brought upon her annals by the Act 1720, I shall feel it cause of much thankfulness to God, however painful in themselves they now are.

The doctrines stated in the major proposition of the libel, as contrary to the Scriptures, and the standards of the church; are thus expressed, "Universal atonement, and pardon through the death of Christ, and that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation." *Understanding these expressions in the sense in which I might use them*, my answer to the libel is, that it is *altogether irrelevant*, inasmuch as the statement of the major proposition is *altogether untrue*, and I now desire, as briefly as may be, without the risk of obscurity, to state to my Brethren the doctrines of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, and that assurance is of the essence of faith, and essential to salvation, *as I hold and teach* them: showing their consistency with, and authority from, the Holy Scriptures, and then, that they are in nothing contrary to, but are altogether in harmony with, our church's standards.

I. These doctrines are the doctrines of Scripture.

It may give distinctness to consider universal atonement

and pardon through the death of Christ, here stated as one doctrine, as in truth they are, separately.

First, As to the extent of the atonement; I hold and teach that Christ died for all men—that the propitiation which he made for sin, was for all the sins of all mankind —that those for whom he gave himself an offering and a sacrifice unto God for a sweet smelling savour, were the children of men without exception and without distinction. And this the Scriptures teach.

It is written in Deut. xvii. 15, "Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother." Upon this principle God hath ordained a kingdom in the hand of a mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ. "Thou spakest in vision to thy Holy One, and saidst, I have laid help on one that is mighty; I have exalted one *chosen out of the people.*"* The Lord Jesus is therefore set before us, first as our brother, and then as our king; and his work in our flesh—the atonement which he made for sin—the offering of himself a sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour unto God—the giving himself a ransom for many, is first the manifestation of his meeting the law of God as our brother; and is then the foundation of his throne as our king; and what the scriptures teach concerning him in both respects, equally prove the extent of the atonement, as for all mankind.

As our brother—our fellow-servant—come, by his own voluntary deed, under the law of God, under which we were created, it was due from him that he should love his neighbour as himself, and every man was his neighbour; therefore that work by which he expressed his love, and proved it was a work for all. Certainly we know he was made under the law—certainly we know that he magnified

* Psalm lxxxix. 19.

the law and made it honourable—certainly we know that by one work he both bore its curse, and fulfilled its requirements—certainly we know that that law is love, yea, love to all : and to limit the love of Christ to some from among those to whom he became related, as bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh, would be to deny that the righteous law of God had any fulfilment in him. "Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God ; neither he that loveth not his brother, for this is the message (margin *commandment*) that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. Not as Cain who was of that wicked one, *and slew his brother.*"* "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him—hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us, and we ought to *lay down our lives for the brethren.*"†

Again, as our king—he of whom it is written, "Unto me every knee shall bow," the principle of his reigning is his manifested love to all. The footing upon which his exaltation to the throne is placed, is that "he loved righteousness," even the righteous law of love. "Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness ; therefore O God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."‡ The homage that is required to this King, is the homage of love ; the ground upon which it is demanded, is, that "He hath loved us and given himself for us :" and the condemnation to which men are exposed, and which bringeth along with it the wrath to come, is the refusing to have such a one to reign over us. Therefore it is clear that the work by which he hath manifested the love which hath been rewarded with the throne on which he sits, has been a work of love for all who are called upon to obey the sceptre of his kingdom.

* 1 John iii. 10. † Ver. 15.
‡ Psalm xlv. 7.

The ordination of a kingdom in the hand of a Mediator —the manifestation of the Lord Jesus, first in suffering humanity, the man of sorrows—the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; and then as God's King upon Zion, reigning in righteousness—all has its explanation in the result that the Son is to deliver up the kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all. Therefore when we see first character manifested apart from power in what Christ did in his state of humiliation; and then, power acting according to that character in his glory; God is teaching us truly to know himself; first to know what he is, that he is love, and then, to know that *he* who is love is God—that power belongs to Him alone to whom also belongs mercy. Thus it is the glory of God which we have unveiled to us in the face of the Lord Jesus Christ—hence can Jesus say of himself, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father;" and while we are contemplating in the history of the Messiah, the history of a love suffering unto death for its enemies, and then taking the seat of power, and on the ground that it hath so loved, beseeching these its enemies to be reconciled to its sceptre, we are not only seeing the award of the righteous God to him who loved righteousness, but we are seeing God vindicating the character of his own government, and proving that He hath another claim on the hearts of his intelligent creatures than that they depend upon him—even that he loves them. To limit the atonement is to deny that this is the counsel of God which he hath accomplished in Jesus Christ; seeing that if Christ only loved some, and died for some, we have no longer the Creator revealed in the Redeemer; and we can no longer say to every man, that he is to look to the sufferings of Calvary if he would know the heart of Him in whom he lives, and moves and has his being—and we cannot say, that that which was prophesied of the forerunner of the Lord, that he should say unto the cities of Judah,

Behold your God, was fulfilled when John the Baptist said of Jesus of Nazareth, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

To be more particular.

In more pointedly and specifically vindicating this doctrine, of the universal extent of the atonement, from the charge of being inconsistent with the Scriptures, seeing that there is no specification, in the libel, of any portion of the Word of God as opposed to it; I would *first* distinctly deny that it is any where stated in the Scriptures, that the work of Christ was *only* for some men. I am aware that certain passages are often quoted as amounting to such a statement; these are John x. 10, 15, 27, 28, 29, and xv. 13—16, Titus ii. 14, Eph. v. 25. Yet it is manifest that these passages only contain the assertion of a part of a wider truth, by which that which they state is comprehended. It is utterly unwarrantable to say, that when Christ states that he lays down his life for the sheep, he denies that he has also laid down his life for the many who refuse to receive him as the good Shepherd, and to follow him as the sheep of his pasture; Or that, whilst he recognises the election of the Father in the coming of those who come to him for life; and regards them as given to him, and not as drawn out of the mass by any peculiar readiness in them to be attracted by the love which he was manifesting to all, that therefore he teaches, that there was no such love to all manifested. It is unnecessary to consider the passages singly, as the principle on which they are all misapplied is the same, viz. understanding the statement of the love manifested to some, as amounting to a denial of the love manifested to the rest.

If indeed there had been no statements but those in question on the subject of the work of Christ, with reference to those for whom it was undertaken, it might have been assumed as likely that it had no more extended reference than that which was expressed; although, even in that case,

simple silence would not be enough to prove that there was nothing true beyond what was stated; but it must be held utterly unwarrantable to use such an argument to the *contradiction* of *distinct* and *pointed* statements of the Word of God. The Scriptures say that "God so loved the *world* that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life."* Nothing but a distinct statement that the *world* does not mean the *world* can limit this declaration as to the object of the work of Christ.

The Scriptures say, He is the propitiation "for the sins of the *whole world:*"† nothing but a distinct and pointed contradiction could warrant us in hesitating to receive these words in their plain and obvious meaning; and even such a contradiction could only have the effect of leaving us in the dark as to what the truth of God was; for *no words* could more plainly say that Christ did *not* die for all, than these say that *He did.*

The Scriptures say that "All we like sheep had gone astray, and that the Lord laid upon him the iniquity of us all."‡ And we cannot hesitate to believe the *all* who have gone astray are the same *all* whose iniquities were laid on Jesus.

The Scriptures say that "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life:"§ and it is manifest, that no words could be more fitted to mislead us than these are, if the *all* upon whom the judgment hath come to condemnation, be not the same *all* upon whom the free gift hath come to justification of life.

The ordination of the kingdom in the hand of a Mediator is announced in the second Psalm, "Yet have I set my King

* John iii. 16. † 1 John ii. 2.
‡ Isaiah liii. 6. § Rom. v. 18.

upon my Holy Hill of Zion. I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said to me, thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee ;"* and in Acts xiii. 32, we have this ordination of God announced as the Gospel, "And we declare unto you *glad tidings,* how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again ; as is also written in the second Psalm, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.' As concerning that He raised him from the dead, no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David,"† (referring to that passage, Isaiah lv. which proceeds thus, "Behold I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people.") Such intimations could not be given as good news to every man, were not love to every man, as we have already stated, the foundation of Christ's throne. Accordingly every form in which the Gospel is addressed to sinners manifests that its substance is good will and love to them.

"The angel said unto them, Fear not, for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people, For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour which is Christ the Lord."‡ Thus to these shepherds, spoken to just as of the family of man, the birth of Christ *the Lord* is announced as the *glad tidings of the birth of a Saviour to them.*

"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven, for the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world."§ Thus does Christ announce himself as the bread of life given *unto them* in speaking to a mixed multitude, yea, in speaking to a multitude whom

* Psalm ii. 6.
† Acts xiii. 32.
‡ Luke ii. 10.
§ John vi. 32, 33.

he immediately afterwards reproves for their rejection of him. "But I said unto you, that ye also have seen me and believe not."* Yet to them did he announce it as glad tidings, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven, if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give him is my *flesh*, which I will give for the life of the world."†—So that in saying my Father giveth you the true bread—he saith, as elsewhere to some from among the many of whom it was true—"this is my body, which was given for you: this cup is the New Testament in my blood shed for you."‡

"Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith unto thee, Give me to drink, thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water."§ Thus are we taught, that did this woman know the gift of God, she would have known that she had a share in it, and that the life which was in Christ was in him for her; and when she knew the gift of God, and was made instrumental in bringing her countrymen to Jesus, thus did they express their knowledge, saying to the woman, "Now we believe not because of thy saying, but we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world."‖

"If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son."¶ Here we learn, that the condition of him who believes the gospel is that he says, "God hath given to *us* eternal life;" and that in saying *us*, he means the *chil-*

* John vi. 36. † John vi. 51. ‡ Luke xxii. 19, 20.
§ John iv. 10. ‖ John iv. 42. ¶ 1 John v. 9—11.

dren of men, is manifest in this, that every child of Adam who cannot respond to the word—who does not join him and say also—God hath given us eternal life, is chargeable with denying the testimony which God hath given concerning his Son. And this is the picture of God and men here set before us.—God saying to men, I have given you eternal life, and some men believing God and answering, Thou hast given us eternal life, and some men saying, We have no proof that God hath given *us* eternal life, and thus making God a liar.—And is it not most obvious that if all believed God, all would be saying, God hath given us eternal life, and therefore that in very truth, God *hath* given, and hath declared himself to have given eternal life to all.

"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the *gospel* which I *preached* unto you. For I delivered unto you *first of all*, that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again according to the Scriptures."* Here we are taught what it was that the apostle had FIRST announced to the Corinthians; when finding them in the condition of heathenism, he preached to them the gospel; and then he had told them, speaking of them and himself together, as alike interested in the work of Christ, although at that time *they* knew not that interest, and *he* did, "Christ died for our sins." It is impossible to escape the conviction that their knowledge that Christ died for their sins, of which he supposes the Corinthians in possession, he also states them to have received from himself at his first coming amongst them, as the *good news* which he brought them, and that in now speaking to them when they were believers, and saying Christ died for our sins, he is just using the very expression, and making the very same annunciation, which he had made when speaking to them,

* 1 Cor. xv. 1, 3.

yet unbelievers—and that the fact that Christ died for them was not inferred from the fact that they were believers, but was itself the fact which at his first appearance among them, he had asked them to believe.

While the gospel announces a cause of joyfulness to all, in the work of God in Christ, and the appointment of him as the Mediator, it ever addresses to men a demand on them that they meet the counsel of God in Christ, by repenting towards God and being reconciled to God. Now by the footing on which this call is placed, and the inducement to compliance with it held out, the scriptures distinctly teach the universality of the atonement.

"Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ: Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do. Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; FOR the promise is *unto you* and unto your children, and to all that are afar off; as many as the Lord our God shall call."* Thus is the Gospel promise declared to be unto men who are addressed as still in unbelief; and this promise made the ground upon which they are called to repent.

"Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech by us, we pray in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God; *for* he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."† "We then as workers together with him, beseech also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain."‡ Here the apostle, in writing to the Corinthians, introduces the general statement of the word of reconcilia-

* Acts ii. 36—39. † 2 Cor. v. 20, 21. ‡ Ver. 1.

tion which he was commissioned to preach. He called upon men, saying, Be ye reconciled to God. He made the foundation of this call an act of love on the part of God towards them, as it was towards himself, saying, "*for* he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;" and, in the realization of this love, as having already come forth upon them, he beseeches them that they "receive not the grace of God in vain," that is to say, himself once a rebel, he comes to the other rebels with whom he had been joined in league against their sovereign; and now reconciled and brought back to his allegiance, by knowing his own part in a love manifested to him and them, he announces to them their part in it, and calls upon them, like him, to be reconciled. It is manifest, that the whole power of the exhortation is lost if any of them could turn and ask what proof there was that *they* were the objects of the deed of love upon which he founded it, and that he was not in the condition to tell them with certainty that they were.

As the gospel is accompanied with the call to be reconciled to God, so is it with the admonition to share in the feelings of God towards our fellow-men, and to the expression of these feelings in asking from God, for them, that good which he hath taught us is according to his good will towards them. By the manner in which this instruction is conveyed to us, the Scriptures also teach the universal extent of the atonement.

As to sharing in the feeling of God to others, we are thus taught, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, *if* God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."* Setting before us the family of men, ourselves and others—as under the love manifested by the gift of Christ, as the propitiation for our sins, and expected to

* 1 John iv. 10.

love each other, with the love wherewith God has thus loved us all. To the same effect is also a passage already quoted, "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."*

As to praying for others, we are thus taught, "I exhort therefore that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for *all men;* for kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth; for there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time."† Here it is manifest that we are exhorted to pray for *all, because* that is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour—that it is proved to be good and acceptable in the sight of God, *because* God WILL have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth; and the existence of this will on the part of God, is proved by the truth, that as there is one God, so there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, and that this Mediator, in whom we see God, and in knowing whom we know God, gave himself a ransom for all. So that the call to pray for all rests on the willingness of God to save all, as manifested by the death of Christ for all.

While the Scriptures call us to repentance towards God, and would teach us to have the mind of God in us towards others, by considerations which imply the universality of the atonement, they teach the same doctrine by the view they give of the future history of men, and of the character and results of that judgment which awaits them. It is appointed to all men once to die, and after death the judg-

* 1 John iii. 16. † 1 Tim. ii. 1—6.

ment: This judgment supposes resurrection from the dead —it supposes some common rule or principle of judgment; and one judge having equal right and authority over all.

If we consider the first of these things—that the men who are to be judged are to be raised for judgment, and inquire what the Scriptures teach on the subject of resurrection, we are taught what distinctly implies the universality of the atonement, and (as it is written) that "Christ tasted death for every man."*—"For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, *even so* in Christ shall all be made alive: but every man in his own order, Christ the first-fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and authority and power; for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy which shall be destroyed is death."† Here we learn that the resurrection of the dead has come by Christ, and that all the dead shall be made alive in Christ. Accordingly we find, in the book of Revelation, the destruction of the last enemy, death, thus recorded,—"And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire; this is the second death;"‡ so that after the final judgment there is no record of the death which came through the first Adam, and which the second Adam tasted for every man, so bringing in the resurrection of the dead.

Again, as to the principle or rule of that judgment which awaiteth all men, and for which they are to be raised, that which the Scriptures teach on this subject, equally implies the universality of the atonement. Paul thus describes the judgment of God—"For there is no respect of persons with God; for as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in

* Heb. ii. 9. † 1 Cor. xv. 21—26. ‡ Rev. xx. 14.

the law, shall be judged by the law, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel."* One talent—his forgiving love, flowing through the atonement of Christ as a goodness leading men to repentance, is that for which God holds all men responsible, and according as it hath or has not led them to repentance, shall they be judged. Under the darkest heathenism with which man hath ever enveloped himself, the charge of God against his ungodliness is, "Despisest thou the riches of my goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance, but, after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God."† And in these last times, and this dispensation of the Spirit, the "scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, where is the promise of his coming,"‡ are herein condemned of the Lord, in that they understand not that the "Lord is not slack concerning his promise as some men count slackness, but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; neither account that the long-suffering of our God *is salvation*."§ This one grace—one goodness, giving opportunity to return to God, revealed with different measures of light, in that God hath never left himself without a witness, is the fruit of the atonement made once for all, and therefore, saith the Apostle, "God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel." No doubt that is a far higher light, for which *he* is responsible, to whom it is preached that Christ is risen, and hath received the promise of the Father, and is soon coming for judgment, than that for which *he* is responsible, who, in his condition of rebellion, has God's forgiving love announced to him, and

* Rom. ii. 11, 12, 16.
† Rom. ii. 4, 5.
‡ 2 Pet. iii. 4.
§ 2 Pet. iii. 9.

God's call to repentance addressed to him by the rain from heaven, and the fruitful seasons; but of the least manifestation of that goodness which affords space for return to God, the atonement is the great channel, and the only explanation, consistent with the glory of the holiness and righteousness of God.

And as to His right to judge, who is revealed as the judge, the universality of the atonement is taught by the statements of Scripture on this subject also; inasmuch as the bond which connects Christ with all mankind, is given as the reason why he is appointed judge of all. "For the Father judges no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son. He hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man."* In the 19th chapter of Luke, our Lord thus speaks of his going to receive a kingdom, "A certain nobleman went unto a far country to receive a kingdom to himself and to return." In Revelation 5th chap. we see him, as in the far country, receiving the kingdom, thus described, "And I looked, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne." We have thus his receiving the book of the inheritance, connected with his character as the Lamb that had been slain. And when he returns and calls for his enemies that they may be slain before him, we have his right over them declared, and the refusal to acknowledge his right, represented as the just ground of their judgment. We cannot thus see Christ reigning and judging as the Son of man, receiving the inheritance as the Lamb that had been slain, and at the same time punishing sin as rebellion against his rightful authority,

* John v. 22, 27.

without understanding that we are taught by these things, that "he gave himself a ransom for all," and that, according as it is written, those who deny his Lordship over them, "*Deny the Lord that bought them.*"*

But the counsel of God revealed to us in his word, contains a farther discovery besides that of his present *grace* to men, and the judgment that awaits them; in that it carries us back from the contemplation of the distinction that holds among men, between those who receiving the grace of God in vain, are heirs of damnation, and have awaiting them the wrath to come; and those who, receiving the grace of God into believing hearts, are heirs of glory, and partakers in the kingdom that is to be revealed, to an electing purpose in God, which hath been accomplished in that work of the Father, whereby they have been made willing to receive the Son to reign in their hearts. Now, what the scriptures state on the subject of Election, distinctly teaches also the universal extent of the atonement. Thus it is written, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus Christ."† By which words we are made to know that the thing to which the Elect are chosen, in respect of Christ, and by which they are marked and distinguished from the non-elect, is the obedience and *sprinkling* of His blood (which is the same with *the purging the conscience* from dead works, Heb. ix. 14), and *not* the having that blood *shed for them.* In like manner it is written, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son."‡ *Not* to the having the blood of his Son shed for the remission of their sins, which is no where said to be distinctive of them; and which, had it been distinctive, we would have expected to find enu-

* 2 Pet. ii. 1. † 1 Pet. i. 2. ‡ Rom. viii. 29.

merated among the links of the chain, by which God's foreknowledge of them is connected with their ultimate glory. The Elect are also thus addressed,* "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, *that ye should shew forth the praises of Him* WHO HATH CALLED YOU OUT OF DARKNESS INTO HIS MARVELLOUS LIGHT."* The light into which they were called was the light of the sun of righteousness; the praises (margin, *virtues*) of God which they were to show forth, were his glory in the face of Jesus Christ: that light of the sun of righteousness—that glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, was altogether independent of their being brought to know it—it was the manifested grace to all men —IN *their being brought to* KNOW *it, was their election shewn.*

On these grounds, therefore, do I hold the doctrine of universal atonement to be the doctrine of scripture, *viz.* That there is not one word pointedly or distinctly limiting the atonement—that there are many expressions distinctly averring that the work of Christ has been for *all men*—that the appointing him King of Zion, and ordaining a mediatorial kingdom in his hand, are announced as good news to *all men*—that the various forms in which this gospel of the kingdom is preached, contain internal evidence that Christ died for all—that the footing on which the call to repentance is addressed to sinners, is the manifested love of God in Christ to them—that the ground upon which the obligation to love our brethren is put, is the love of God in Christ, and the call to prayer for them is founded on Christ's having given himself a ransom for all—that the judgment to come both in respect of a resurrection of men for judgment, of the principle of the judgment, and of his title to judge, before whose judgment-seat *all* must stand—teach the same doctrine—and finally, that it is implied in the statements of the scripture on the subject of election.

* 1 Pet. ii. 9.

Second. The doctrine of universal pardon through the death of Christ.

And now I come to that part of the subject, on which I am most liable to misapprehension, and on which there has been most misrepresentation. On a subject of such vast importance, it were an awful evil to divert men's attention from the contemplation of substantial truth to mere verbal controversy; and with the knowledge that there are some among those who hesitate to adopt this form of expression, who do substantially hold that which is intended to be conveyed by it, I have found it a great relief from the fear that the opposition awakened had been produced by a word, to see that all the books published on the subject proceed on the admission, that the whole question resolves itself into the question of the extent of the atonement.

The pardon of sin may be understood to mean either an act of indemnity to the sinner, giving him security from all consequences of having sinned against God, irrespective of any condition as to moral character; or as the act of God in receiving back to the bosom of his love the returning sinner; or thirdly, as the removing the judicial barrier which guilt interposes between the sinner and God; so making the fact of being a sinner no hinderance to his coming to God, now, as to a reconciled Father.

In the first of these senses, the word has been generally used in the books that have been written to disprove the doctrine of universal pardon; and so understanding the term, it has not been difficult to make out that universal pardon is identical with universal salvation; and also that it confounds all moral distinctions as existing in the mind of God, and makes the sceptre of his kingdom no longer a sceptre of righteousness. But such a pardon is altogether a fiction of the mind's own—it is no where recognised in the scriptures as having any existence. Not only is it not the portion of all, but in fact it is not the portion of any:

to neither unbeliever nor believer is any immunity from future wrath secured, *apart* from his being prepared for being found of God in peace, at that day, in which he shall judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ. To hold otherwise is distinct antinomianism, and makes the atonement something to take those for whom it has been made out of the judgment of God; and not, as it really is, something to prepare them for that judgment, by bringing them into the condition in which they can say, "We may have boldness in the day of judgment, because as he is, so are we in this world." I need scarcely add, therefore, that *in such a sense as this, I do not hold the doctrine of universal pardon;* and that if this be the sense attached to the words in the major proposition of the libel, I may admit such a doctrine to be a relevant foundation for a charge, inferring penalties, but deny that it can in any way affect me.

Again, understanding pardon, as the act of God in receiving back to the bosom of his love the returning sinner —so understood, it is from the very nature of the thing, limited to the sinners who do return—the prodigal, still remaining in the far country, cannot possibly be received into the father's house. In this sense, pardon is very generally employed in the Scriptures, and is expressive, not of *one* act of God in reference to the sinner on his first believing in the love of God, but of the *continual* acting of God towards the sinner, living in a condition of intercourse and communion with God, and so is it the object of prayer to the believer continually, and to the last hour of his life in the flesh,whatever may have been his attainments in holiness, or conformity to the mind of God. It is in this sense that in the Psalms, which have been given us as the language of the spirit of adoption in the children of God, while still dwelling in a body of sin and death, the word is constantly used; and indeed the prayer for it implies more than

simply, that God would *receive* us to near communion with himself, being better explained by the words that he would *take* us unto communion with himself; the thing entreated for being, an outputting of his divine power in separating between us and our sin, as a real thing; and in raising us out of ourselves, to dwell in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, our living head.—Thus the Psalmist prays, " Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness; according to the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions." And, " Wash me throughly from mine iniquities, and cleanse me from my sins."—Again, " Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities."—And " Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me; cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me, restore unto me the joy of thy salvation, and uphold me with thy free spirit." Here it is manifest, that it is not remission of sin, as the removal of a judicial sentence, nor adoption into the family of God, as the prayer of one not yet knowing himself to be the object of the love of God, that is entreated—but that these are the prayers of one knowing God as his God, and having confidence in the present good will of God towards him, to give him good gifts, and so imboldened to ask of the Holy One that he would make him partaker in his holiness, and dwell in him by his Spirit—thus might such be—thus were such—the prayers of the Lord Jesus in the days of his flesh, while, notwithstanding of his having humbled himself to dwell in our nature, and to be made in the likeness of sinful flesh, he not the less continued to be the well-beloved of the Father, as he was the Holy One of God. Of course, in this second sense, I do not hold pardon to be universal, inasmuch as I do not hold that all have repented and returned to the Lord; and in so saying, I meet the many quotations which have been brought from the Scriptures to prove

that pardon is limited to those who believe, and to those who repent. If, therefore, this be the meaning of pardon as spoken of in the libel, I admit that to hold such a pardon was universal, would be a relevant ground of charge, as being contrary to the word of God; but I deny that this admission, any more than the former, in any way affects me.

The third sense of the expression pardon, enumerated above, *viz.* That it is an act of God, referring to a sinner, by which he declares his having sinned, to be no longer any barrier to his returning to the enjoyment of the light of God's love and favour; making the consciousness of guilt to be no longer a just cause of fear in seeking the face of God; yea, giving the assurance that it is not only a righteous thing in God to receive back into favour, not taking into account the sin justly chargeable against him; but even, so to speak, to help him back, and by his own Spirit to lift him up into the light of his own love, and enjoyment of his own holiness. *In this sense* I do hold—and in this sense I teach, the doctrine of universal pardon, through the death of Christ. For such a pardon I believe the Scriptures to reveal as extended to all—as the result of the atoning sacrifice of Christ for all—as the fruit of his propitiation for the sins of the world—as the condition in which God's accepting the sacrifice of Christ for mankind, has placed the children of men: and if it be this doctrine that the Libel designates as "universal pardon through the death of Christ," I deny the relevancy of the libel in respect of it, with reference to the Scriptures, holding it to be altogether beyond controversy that this is the doctrine of the word of God.

The character of God as the fountain of life is so strange and ununderstood a matter to the natural heart, which has never so known him, but has ever had acquaintance only with the broken cisterns which hold no water, that a par-

don, thus explained, seems to be a much less valuable boon than our enunciation of it as the pearl of great price—that, in the knowledge of which, the soul feels itself possessed of all it can desire, would intimate: and it is difficult to get people, even intellectually, to conceive that this is any thing else than the Arminian doctrine of God's readiness to forgive and pardon all, on condition of their repenting and believing. In truth, however, no two doctrines can be more widely different. Arminianism is the sanctifying with the name of religion pure self-righteousness. After a man is supposed to have repented and believed, on that system, he is only then in that condition of *right to come to God* with confidence, in which, according to the true doctrine of the Scriptures, he was placed by the sacrifice of Christ, as a propitiation for his sins; and as long as repenting and believing occupy in men's minds this place of *preliminary requisites,* in order to having *title* to approach God with boldness, of confidence in his fatherly love to us, and free acceptance of us, it makes little difference whether we *professedly* hold the system known by the name of *Arminianism,* or attempt to separate between ourselves and it by limiting the atonement, and by holding strictly that the faith and the repentance are the gifts of God.

As I am simply desirous to be distinctly understood, and wish for no indulgence which may arise from misapprehension, I am anxious that the free and unconditional character of the pardon which I believe and preach, may be apprehended, and this may be the better secured by my stating, in what respect I conceive the believer and the unbeliever to be the same, and in what respect in different situations in regard to this pardon.

They are, in the *same* situation, in that the *right* and *title* which they have to approach God with confidence, and put trust in him for things according to his will, is the same—even the place which he has given them, in giving

them Christ to be their living head—setting him forth as a "Witness, a Leader, a Commander to the people," "exalted a Prince and a Saviour to grant repentance and remission of sins;" having led their captivity captive, and received gifts for the rebellious, that God the Lord might dwell among them." *Having repented*—one particular in which they differ—has *not conferred* the right, for it has been but *taking advantage of* the right—my *title* to return to God, is not in the fact that I do return, but my returning is my availing myself of a title to return *antecedently conferred by God*, in the exercise of his free love. Again, *believing*—the other particular in which they differ—has not conferred the right in question, seeing that believing is nothing more or less than receiving *as true* God's testimony on the subject of that right; and holding it as a fact, *because God hath said it*, "that God hath given to us eternal life, and that this life is in his Son." My believing creates nothing—by believing I only receive what God has already given, light into my understanding and love into my heart—God himself to dwell in me by his Spirit who is the Spirit of Christ, and who is truth.

Believers and unbelievers are on the other hand in different situations, in respect of the pardon, in that believers are drinking of the fountain of life, of which pardon is the opening, while unbelievers are receiving no life whatever from it, but are as if it had been yet sealed.—This is *a present* difference; but inasmuch as God hath appointed a day in which he shall judge the world in righteousness, and inasmuch as the pardon extended to men has been intended to prepare men for being found of God in peace on that day, by reconciling them to God, and so making them righteous, there is *this* awful and solemn *difference* between believers and unbelievers, as to pardon, in respect of their *prospects for the future*, that, while to the former, the forgiveness that hath been extended to them, has been the

means of leading them back to God, and so saving them from the wrath to come, and giving them an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in Christ—to the latter, the same pardon is the ground of condemnation, and is that precious talent committed to them of the Lord, for their folding up of which in a napkin, and failing to cultivate it for the fruits of righteousness, they shall, if they abide in unbelief, have their place assigned them in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.

Distinctions, which successively arising heresies make it important to mark, are rather implied than expressed in the record of truth, of which all heresy is the perversion—it is, therefore, by the study of such subjects as the character of God as a fountain of life—the nature of repentance, as an actual *transition* from the condition of not giving God glory, to the condition of glorifying and enjoying him—of the nature of a salvation by faith, as a salvation by the knowledge of God—of the nature of righteousness, as an intelligent sympathy and oneness with the moral mind of God, and delight in his will—of the nature of obedience, whether of feeling, thought, word, or action, as the free working of a mind whose will is the same with the will of God, and which obeys with the same feeling with which God commands, truly testifying by its obedience that its judgment is, "good is the will of the Lord"—of the nature of the propitiation for sin, as a manifestation of God's character in respect of sin, not for the purpose of making it possible for sinners to be taken out of his righteous judgment, but for the purpose of preparing them for judgment, by causing them to share in his estimate of sin, and so preparing them for being delivered from wrath in his righteousness—it is by the study of such subjects as these, that we shall come to feel that not one, or many passages, only, of the word of God, contain the doctrine on the subject of

pardon now held, *but that it is embodied in the whole of God's revelation of himself to man*—yea, is implied in all his present dealing with the children of men, whether in what is called the department of providence, or the department of grace; and is the explanation of his present forbearance, and the form of that goodness which is leading to repentance; as it will be the foundation of his future judgment, and the justification of his righteousness, in the outpouring of the wrath that is to come.

But to consider the subject with more special reference to particular statements of the Word of God, I quote these following:—

It is prophesied with reference to the first coming of the Messiah, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy."*

If this be the annunciation of any less work, with reference to our sin, than that which I have been stating as universal pardon, I do not know what distinct conception can be attached to the expressions—"finishing transgression, making an end of sins, and making reconciliation for iniquity." As an actual thing, sin hath *not* been put away; therefore, unless put away as a thing *imputed,* it hath been put away in no sense at all.

The Spirit also, speaking in prophecy, says, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned, for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."† This is connected with the work of Christ, on his first coming, by the words which follow: "The voice of him that crieth

* Daniel ix. 24. † Is. xl. 1, 2.

in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord."* And again—" Oh thou that bringest good tidings to Zion,† get thee up into the high mountain: Oh thou that bringest good tidings to Jerusalem, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid, say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God."‡ Which prophecy was fulfilled, when John the Baptist seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, " Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Thus are the words—" Cry unto her that her iniquity is pardoned," and the words " behold your God," combined in the fulfilment—behold the " Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is peculiarly occupied with the priestly office of Christ, it is written—" Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had, by himself, *purged our sins*, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."§—and again, " For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us—nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year, with blood of others, for then must he *often* have suffered since the foundation of the world—but now *once*, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to *put away* sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment—so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."‖ —These expressions, "*purged our sins*"—"*put away sin*" —distinctly teach the doctrine which I am now advocating; and when the Apostle passes from the contemplation of the

* Isa. xl. 3. † Marginal reading. ‡ Ver. 9.
§ Heb. i. 3. ‖ Heb. ix. 24.

fact that it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment, to Christ's having offered himself to bear the sins of many, limiting the goodness of the news contained in his second coming to those "*who look for him*"—he is obviously proceeding upon the same principle of *present pardon* to *all* through the death of Christ, and future judgment with reference to that pardon, which has been held above.

But I most specially crave attention to the argument held upon the subject of sacrifices *for* sin, and remission *of* sin, in the 10th chapter of the same epistle to the Hebrews.—The apostle there argues, that the sacrifices offered year by year continually, could not make perfect as pertaining to the conscience ; that it could not relieve from the sense of judicial condemnation ; that this they could not do, because it was impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin : and therefore that in token of their inability to accomplish this, and of their being but the shadow of a good thing which was to come, they were repeated from year to year ; but that what the shadow could not accomplish the substance did ; that sin *was put away* by the one offering of Christ ; and that, because there was remission of sins, therefore there was no more sacrifice, "Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin."* And that by remission of sin, as a thing which he had proved, and by the consideration of which he exhorts them to draw near to God—he means just that *access to God through Christ* which has been described above ; as the pardon that embraces, and is upon all, is manifest from the conclusion of his reasoning, "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus—by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say his flesh ; and having an high priest over the house of God, LET US DRAW NEAR with a true heart and in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from

* Heb. x. 18.

an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."*

The following passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians teaches the same view of the salvation that is through Christ. "For he is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of twain one new man so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body, by the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh: for through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father."† The *peace* here represented as being made by Christ through his cross, is explained as our *having access* through him by one Spirit unto the Father—to preach this peace to men, therefore, is to declare to them that they have access through Christ, by the Holy Ghost, unto God the Father—this is the same with announcing to them that they have access into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way; and, in *both* forms of expression, that is declared which I have stated as the pardon which I preach, viz. that it is an act of God, referring to a sinner, by which he declares his having sinned to be no longer any barrier to his returning to the enjoyment of the light of God's love and favour; making the consciousness of guilt no longer a just cause of fear in seeking the face of God—yea, giving the assurance that it is not only a righteous thing in God to receive back into favour, not taking into account the sin justly chargeable against him, but even, so to speak, to help him back, and by his own spirit to lift him up into the light of his own love, and enjoyment of his own holiness.

With this accords the account given of the ministry of reconciliation by the apostle, writing to the Corinthian Church,

* Heb. x. 19. † Eph. ii. 14.

"that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."* And in this have we the true conception given us of the character of our present condition, as not under the law, but under grace—that God accounts of Christ as the head and representative of the children of men, that he has given him power over all flesh, and fitted him as a fountain of life to all flesh —that to the end that they may have space for receiving this life, their sin not imputed to them, nor their personal guilt accounted of, while the day of grace lasts ; at the same time that it is the purpose of God to bring them to account for their share in this grace, which he hath caused to pass upon them ; condemning them, or acknowledging them, according as they have, or have not received the grace of God in vain.

I might proceed to quote passages in which the gospel is announced as glad tidings, and the effect of believing it set forth as being immediate peace and joy ; to show, from the consideration of the circumstances in which that message finds men, that it could not have furnished a reasonable ground for such feelings, did it not reveal to them the remission of their sins ; and, to the same effect, I might also quote the passages in which believers are addressed as knowing that they have the forgiveness of their sins in Christ, which knowledge they could only have had because the apostles in first coming amongst them had preached to them, through Christ, the forgiveness of sins—But if once the principle, on which such passages are evidence in this matter, be recognised, viz. that faith being the belief of the testimony of God, can contain no cause of rejoicing beyond the limit of the testimony itself, it will be felt unnecessary to quote particular passages, seeing that, upon this ground, almost every word addressed to the primitive churches might be founded on.

This then is my answer on the subject of universal pardon,

* 2 Cor. v. 19.

with reference to the relevancy of the libel; pardon, in the sense in which its universality has been held to lead to licentiousness, viz. *immunity* from the consequences of sin without reference to moral character, I neither hold as to some, or as to all; believing that there is no such thing under the government of a righteous God—pardon, as God's act in the Spirit, through Christ, of taking us up into fellowship and communion with himself, and raising us up out of the deep pit and miry clay of our sinful flesh, I hold *as limited to the elect of God*, who, through the faith of God's promises, are partakers of the divine nature, escaping the corruption that is in the world through lust—and the pardon, which is thus limited to them, is ever flowing to them, as the answer of their earnest cry and prayer—God's holy relief vouchsafed to the poor and needy, who are confessing their sins, and hungering and thirsting after righteousness—pardon, *as the removal of the barrier* in the way of our coming to God, which arises from personal guilt, and as the provision of actual strength, in the Spirit, to come to God, I hold to be the gift of God *to all*—in as much as it is contained in the gift of Christ; and is the justification of the statement that God has given to all eternal life in him. If, in the libel, either of the first senses of the expression pardon be intended, I hold not the doctrine stated, and would admit the relevancy of the major proposition—but deny the truth of the minor as connecting me with such a charge.—If the third sense of the word, now explained, be that in which it is used, then I *deny* the relevancy of the charge, seeing that *in that sense* universal pardon through the death of Christ *is the revealed truth of God.*

3. The doctrine that assurance is of the Essence of Faith, and necessary to salvation, is also declared in the libel, to be contrary to the Holy Scriptures.

On this subject much misconception has arisen, from the loose and inaccurate use of terms—Faith being the belief of

God's testimony, assurance of faith should properly mean the confidence in its reality, with which *the thing testified* is contemplated; and this is the Scripture use of the word—at the same time, it is likely, and may be assumed, that the expression is used, in the libel, in the sense in which it is usually employed in theological writings.—In these, it is rather the feeling of *personal interest* in the thing believed, than of the reality of the thing itself, that is intended to be expressed. At the same time, seeing that the words of God are spoken to us *personally*, and intended to be received *as life to ourselves individually*, there is not much reason to complain of this liberty taken with the expression, "Assurance of Faith." So long as men holding a limited atonement, held also that assurance was of the essence of faith, and so required that the love of God in Christ should be felt as *personal love*, in the mind's apprehension of it, though not held to be personal in the record—and so long as faith was thus made to embrace more than the word reveals, there was a risk of very serious error, and a door opened for a very insidious form of self-righteousness, under the name of what was called the appropriating act of faith—but when it is understood that faith needs not to change any thing, but may, taking things as they are, say, *my* Lord and *my* God—so long as it is understood, that the spirit of adoption is the spirit of faith in a *revealed* fatherly love, *then* there is no evil in associating the word faith with those feelings of personal delight in the Lord, and confidence towards God, which are *inseparable* from it. And on this subject I hold and teach, that *in believing* the gospel, there is *necessarily* present in the mind, the *certainty* that the person believing is the object of God's love manifested to him in the gift of Christ—the certainty that he has remission of his sins, the gift of the Spirit, and all things pertaining to life and to godliness, bestowed on him, by the free grace of God; so that he feels himself debtor to God for the gift of eternal life;

and this I hold to be *so* of the essence of faith, that is to say, so necessarily implied in the existence of true faith, that no person can be regarded as in the belief of God's testimony who is not conscious to it.

It is manifest, that no one can consistently hold, that God has given to every man, in Jesus Christ, all things pertaining to life and godliness, and at the same time not hold the doctrine of the assurance of faith as now stated. *In this sense*, therefore, I admit that if it be a relevant charge to infer penalties, to hold the doctrine, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, *then* does there lie a just charge against me—but I do not admit, on the contrary, I distinctly deny, that the doctrine of assurance of faith, *now stated*, is inconsistent with the truth of God.

I feel more difficulty in arguing this point from the Scriptures than either of the others, because the Scriptures *everywhere assume* that to believe God's expressed love, and to be assured of it, are the same thing; indeed it would appear a very strange addition to any authoritative declaration of God, to say, that it was not only to be believed, but that we must be certain it is true. I say this, because I have heard it asked how it should be the case that the Scriptures say so little on the subject of assurance, if it be a matter of so much importance. As I understand the record, there is a demand for assurance every time it is said, Thus saith the Lord—but it has naturally arisen from the limitation of the atonement, that, those holding that doctrine, should appear to themselves entitled to distinguish between the certainty of the truth of what God says, and the assurance of his love to themselves personally.—On their views they were so entitled. Those, likewise, who admitting the extent of the atonement, saw not its results, as placing all men under grace, and including them in the same forgiveness, were, upon another ground, led to make the same se-

paration; seeing that on their system, no one is entitled to rejoice directly in the revealed love of God, but is ever kept at a distance by the inquiry whether he has, indeed, savingly complied with the conditions required of him. But, though on the one system, the denying that the atonement has been for all, and on the other system the denying that the atonement has accomplished remission of sins for all, have led to separating between the certainty of a truth of God's word, and the certainty of our own personal interest in his love, it is manifest, that where neither of these errors is held, but the true character of the atonement as to its extent and its meaning, is recognised, there can be no indulgence extended to any uncertainty in the individual, as to his personal interest in all the promises of God, revealed to be believed; nor can the darkness, or deadness, or want of enjoyment in God, of any one within hearing of the sound of the gospel, be ascribed to any other cause than the direct disbelief of that which the mouth of the Lord hath spoken. It is obvious, therefore, that with the views of the work of God in Christ, above stated, I must ever seek to make my hearers feel themselves placed between the alternatives of, on the one hand, believing God, and rejoicing in his love, as that of a reconciled Father in Christ; or, on the other, remaining uncertain of God's love to them, *through making God a liar*—so that I can never allow any place to the distinction—"I do not doubt God, I only doubt myself" or any similar expression, by which people have lined out for themselves a middle space between dwelling in the light of God's love, and underlying the condemnation of rejecting God's truth.—That *imaginary* middle space is, alas, but too fearfully crowded with the multitudes of perishing sinners, who are slumbering in the fancied security of their lowly estimate of themselves, and saying peace, peace, to their own souls, on the strange ground, that they are not so presumptuous as to think that they have a certain foundation for peace.

As the doctrine which I hold on the subject of assurance of faith, so *necessarily* arises out of the other two doctrines, which I have already vindicated from the charge of being contrary to the Holy Scriptures; and as any one who will be satisfied with that vindication will not feel any need of additional quotations here; and as any one not satisfied with it, can only make an exception in favour of this doctrine of assurance, on ground which I would not take, and do not think to the glory of God, (I refer to what is so often said, that Christ is freely *offered*, that it is kept secret for whom he died; but that the freeness of the offer is a sufficient foundation for an appropriating act of faith in us,) not desiring, I say, the admission of the doctrine of assurance on any such ground, and wishing rather it should appear, as is the truth, to stand or fall with the doctrines now stated on the subject of atonement and remission of sins, I would close this part of my answer to the libel, with a few words to prevent misconception, on a subject, often confounded with that of assurance of faith, but nevertheless quite distinct from it.

The subject to which I refer, is the assurance of being in a state of salvation; an assurance having reference to the distinction between believers and unbelievers—converted and unconverted—regenerate and unregenerate persons; and the object of which is the fact concerning the individual, that he himself belongs now to the class of saved ones. It is obviously quite a different contemplation, to be beholding the glory of God's holy forgiveness shining in the face of Jesus Christ, and reflecting it back with the response of the Spirit of adoption, crying, Abba, Father, which is the condition of assurance of Faith, from being looking inward on oneself, and comparing the past with the present, and gathering the points of contrast between them, saying to oneself, whereas I was once blind, now I see—whereas I was dead, I now live—whereas I was a

stranger to the commonwealth of Israel, I am now a fellow-citizen with the saints, and of the household of God.

It is no doubt, when abounding in the assurance of faith, that, if the eye turns inwardly, and the thoughts are directed to our own state, we shall also enjoy the assurance of being in a state of salvation; but still the two assurances are distinct in themselves, and I at present feel it to be important to refer to the distinction, because, whilst I hold assurance to be of the essence of faith, I do not hold that the converted person is necessarily *always* in a condition of assurance as to his being in a state of salvation; inasmuch as I do not hold it to be impossible for a converted person to be, *at times*, so overcome of the temptations of Satan, causing darkness, through the flesh, as it may be to stand in doubt of the first principles of the oracles of God; and it is manifest that if brought into such darkness, and such unbelief, there must be the interruption to the blessed consciousness of being a child of God, and an heir of glory.

I say, I refer to this subject, although there is no reference to it in the libel, desiring that my views on these subjects, in their relation to each other, should be distinctly understood. If this present recognition of the possibility of interruption of the sense of adoption, be understood, as in any way qualifying what I have already said as to the nature of faith, when it is in exercise, I shall regret it—in my own mind, I see the *widest possible distinction* between the admission that a regenerate person may, for a time, be so overcome of Satan, as to stand in doubt of that truth which is the anchor of his soul, and *in this way* lose the consciousness of security—and the assumption, that without any doubt at all of the word of God, and while not hesitating to admit all that is there spoken of Christ—the assumption, that, in such a case, a man may consistently say, that he doubts whether he himself has an interest in the love of God—and I believe, that the mind that draws

back from the demand for assurance, and feels it to be some relief to be told that one may be saved without it, will not welcome it as any concession, to have it admitted that, in the way of doubting the direct testimony of God, there may be an occasional season of darkness and uncertainty, from falling into this awful sin.

I have now concluded all that I have felt it expedient, for the present, to say, in reference to the statement that the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon, through the death of Christ, as also, that the doctrine, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, are contrary to the Holy Scriptures; and have sought to rest the matter on this ground, that either these expressions are intended to state doctrines *which I do not hold*, in which case I need not be careful to consider them—or, that assuming them to express what I do hold, the assertion that they contain any thing contrary to Scripture, *is untrue*, and the libel consequently irrelevant—I trust I have been enabled to be explicit in my statements, and that my brethren are put in a condition to judge me with reference to the substantial truth of what I hold and teach, and not with reference to any ambiguous and unexplained form of words; and I trust also that they will be enabled to judge, unfettered by any previous impressions, which the discussions connected with these views may have made; and if, after all, the distinctions which I have sought to mark, be not sufficiently broad or apparent to strike *at once*, that they will not withhold that measure of patient consideration, which may be needed to put them in full possession of my meaning.

II. I now proceed to consider the question of relevancy on the several points of doctrine above mentioned, *with reference to the Standards of the Church.*

To defend any doctrine from the charge of being contrary to the Confession of Faith of any church, differs from

the defence of a doctrine from a similar charge in reference to the Scriptures, in these two important respects, that whereas no doctrine is to be preached, of which there is no explicit statement in the Word of God, many doctrines may be taught, as found in the Word of God, concerning which a Confession of Faith may be silent; and inasmuch as while the Scriptures must be held as of unlimited authority, equally in respect of the language they use, as in respect of the matter expressed, a Confession of Faith is only received and approved of "as to the truth of the matter."

In reference to the doctrines in this libel, declared to be inconsistent with the Standards of the Church, I would reply as to the first, the doctrine of Universal Atonement and Pardon through the death of Christ, that the utmost that can be said in support of the charge, is that the present Confession of Faith is silent on the subject; but this, though it were fully admitted, would in truth be nothing on which to found. As to the second doctrine, that Assurance is of the essence of Faith, it is substantially stated in the definition of Faith given; and the impression that it is otherwise, has only arisen from confounding together the distinct subjects of Assurance of Faith and Assurance of being in a state of Salvation.

First. In respect of the first, I am aware that the peculiar use of the word *redemption*, though not altogether unsanctioned by Scripture usage, has occasioned the impression to exist very generally, that the universality of the Atonement is denied, and I shall now state my reasons for holding this to be a serious error. This I judge both from the consideration of the passages that are so misunderstood, and also from the history of the drawing up of the Confession of Faith, and its relation to former Confessions.

The first of the passages to which I refer, is Confes. chap. iii. sect. 6. which is in the following words, "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he by the eternal

and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereto; wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only."

Now if *redemption* in this passage mean the work of atonement done in the person of Christ, the shedding of his blood for the remission of sins, then is there here an express limitation of the Atonement; by if by *redemption* be meant, the actual deliverance of those, with reference to whom it is spoken, from a state of evil into a state of salvation, and be thus of the same import with *Salvation*, then is it a statement not affecting the extent of the Atonement at all, and merely amounting to this, that the persons ultimately saved are those and those alone originally elected of God unto Salvation.

Now, that this is the true view of the passage is manifest from the contrast of a *fall* into an *evil state* and *deliverance from* that *evil state*, contained in the words, "Wherefore they who are elected, being *fallen* in Adam are *redeemed* by Christ;" which is farther manifest from the proofs adduced in support of the doctrine of their being redeemed by Christ, in all of which the deliverance or salvation accomplished is that to which reference is made; they are these, 1 Thess. v. 9—11, "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain *Salvation* by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should *live* together with him."—Titus ii. 14, "Who gave himself for us, that he *might redeem us* from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." Accordingly we have, that the Elect are "effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season,

are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power, through faith unto salvation," given as the parts of the work of their redemption by Christ. The first of the proofs adduced for these links in the chain of redemption is that corresponding enumeration of links connecting God's foreknowledge of his elect with their ultimate glory, given in the Epistle to the Romans, viii. 30, which I have already noticed in considering the statements of Scripture on the subject of election, as implying the universality of the Atonement.

The next passage to which I refer, Confess. chap. viii. sect. 8, is in these words, " To all those for whom Christ purchased redemption he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same, making intercession for them, and revealing unto them in and by the word, the mysteries of salvation; effectually persuading them by his Spirit to believe and obey, and governing their hearts by his Word and Spirit, overcoming all their enemies by his Almighty Power and Wisdom, in such manner and ways as are most consonant to his wonderful and unsearchable dispensation."

This passage clearly establishes the interpretation I have given above of the word *redemption* as used in our Standards as the true one. Redemption cannot mean, the paying of a price, or the giving himself a ransom, seeing that it is here spoken of as a thing purchased, and the account given, of the manner in which Christ doth apply and communicate redemption, is clearly the detail of a personal deliverance from evils, of those to whom it is applied.

The next passage is in the Larger Cat. Quest. 59, " Who are made partakers of redemption through Christ? Ans. Redemption is certainly applied, and effectually communicated to all those for whom Christ has purchased it, who are, in time, enabled by the Holy Ghost to believe in Christ according to the Gospel." It is manifest that the

word *redemption* here has the same meaning of personal deliverance from sin and all its consequences in this passage, which we have found attached to it in those formerly quoted; and that the question, "Who are made partakers of redemption through Christ," is the same with the question, "Who are made partakers of Salvation?" or, "Who are saved through Christ?" This examination of these three passages, and they are those quoted on the subject in the Act of Assembly 1720, surely justifies the conclusion, that it is a decided error to hold that our present Confession of Faith denies the doctrine of Universal Atonement and Pardon through the death of Christ.

The silence of the Confession on this subject, were it even to be interpreted in the most unfavourable way as to the opinions held regarding it by those who drew up this Confession, yea, were it even known, historically, that the prevailing opinion among these persons, was that the Atonement was limited—even in such a case, the silence of the Confession on the subject would be felt to be a cause of thankfulness by every one who understood the awful sin which the Church would have incurred by denouncing so important a part of the truth of God; a sin, of which if she had been guilty, it would have amounted to little, if any thing, short of solemn apostasy. I am not aware, however, that any branch of the church of Christ, of the many into which it formed itself at the Reformation, has been stained with this guilt; on the contrary, the general tone of all the earlier Confessions has been the acknowledgment of the love of God in Christ as a love to all men: but that the silence of our present Confession may not be interpreted to its discredit, I would consider its history with reference to the previous Confessions to which it is immediately related, and more especially with reference to the act of Parliament by which the Assembly that drew it up was called together. The Confessions to which I refer are the 39

Articles of the Church of England, with special reference to which it must be understood; and also the older Confession of our own Church, to which it is importantly related; seeing that it was received "*as in nothing contrary thereto,*"—they are the symbols of doctrine of the Church of England, however, which are specially to be considered; seeing that the act of Parliament appointing the Assembly of Divines at Westminster is entitled, "An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons, assembled in Parliament, for the calling of an assembly of learned and Godly Divines and others, to be consulted with by the Parliament, for the settling of the Government and Liturgy of the Church of England, and for vindicating and clearing the Doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations." There was thus given to that Assembly a deliberative power as to settling of the Government and Liturgy of the Church of England; while as to Doctrine, the duty devolved upon them, and the trust reposed in them, extended no farther than the *vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations.* We are therefore to expect no *new* Doctrine in the Westminster Confession of Faith, other than that contained in the previous Articles and Catechisms of the Church of England; a more guarded expression, and a fuller dwelling upon any point that had been under misrepresentation, we may expect, but certainly nothing new as touching the foundations.

Now we find in the Articles of the Church of England these statements on the extent of the Atonement:—In the 2d Article, entitled, "Of the Word, or Son of God, which was made very man," Christ is spoken of as one "Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."—Again, in the 31st Article, entitled, "Of the one oblation of Christ finished

upon the Cross," we read, "The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for All the sins of the Whole World, both original and Actual; and there is none other Satisfaction for Sin but that alone."—Again, in the Catechism appointed by the Church of England to be learned in preparation for Confirmation, we have the following question and answers appended to the Apostles' Creed—"Quest. What dost thou chiefly learn in these Articles of thy belief? Ans. *First.* I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me and all the World. *Secondly.* In God the Son, who hath redeemed me and *all mankind.* *Thirdly.* In God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the Elect People of God."

Now is it to be held for a moment that an Assembly appointed with no other authority, in respect of these Articles of the Church of England, than simply that of vindicating them from misrepresentation; and consisting of men a great proportion of whom must have subscribed to these very Articles, would have procceded, in the face of the ordinance of their appointment, to draw up Articles flatly denying these fundamental points of the Creed of their Church; and that too without the slightest hint given that they were conscious that they were taking upon themselves to change in any respect that Creed.

But farther, that such statements on the subject of the dealing of God with the Elect, as I have quoted above from the Westminster Confession of Faith, are consistent with the Doctrine of Universal Atonement, and must have been regarded as consistent with it by those who drew up the Confession, is manifest from this, that in the very 39 Articles of the Church of England in which the Doctrine of the Universality of the Atonement is so strongly and pointedly stated, the doctrine held on the subject of Predestination and Election is precisely the same with that in the Westminster Confession of Faith; insomuch, that were

the Article on the extent of the Atonement not given, it would have appeared just as natural to infer that the compilers of the Article on Election, denied the Univer sality of the Atonement, as it has appeared to many that the Article on Election in our present Confession does. These are the words, " Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling:—they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by Adoption: they be made like the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.*

Now, with the exception of not using the word *redemption,* but with the full expression of the meaning attached to it in our Confession, this Article is precisely the same. —If any difficulty should be suggested by the use of the word *redemption,* and not atonement, in the articles above quoted, the least inspection will satisfy that the word there has the meaning of *oblation for sin,* and not of *personal deliverance,* as in our Confession. Why the Westminster Divines should have directed their attention to the work of God for the elect, and not have re-recorded the statements of *their* Church regarding what has been done for the non-elect, it may not be easy to ascertain; but seeing they were appointed to vindicate the doctrine of the Church from misrepresentation, and seeing that one misrepresentation to

* Article 17th.

which the Articles of the Church of England have been often subjected, has been that they savoured of Arminianism, and interfered with the integrity of the doctrine of Election; and seeing that the caution on the subject of teaching Election, appended to the Church of England Articles on that subject, might have favoured misapprehension in the matter, we may obtain from this some key to the apparent difference in the tone of the 39 Articles from that of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and to the great prominence given to the subject of Election in the latter.

This argument appears to me quite conclusive as to the light in which we are to view the Westminster Confession of Faith, *as it came to us from England;* and the terms on which it was received by us is in no respect a weakening of the evidence, for it was received "*As in nothing contrary to the received doctrine of this Kirk.*" Now, that *doctrine* was the doctrine of the Confession of 1560, and of the Palatine Catechism then in use in the Church.* The doctrine of that Catechism may be established by the following question and answer: "Quest. 37. What believest thou when thou sayest, He suffered? Ans. That in the whole time of his life which he continued here upon earth, but especially in the end thereof, he sustained, both in body and in soul, the wrath of God against the *sinne of all mankind.*"† The Confession of 1560, though in its general tone it corresponds with the present Confession, in setting forth, almost exclusively, the history of God's dealing with the elect, yet doth it not only not contain any expression that can possibly be construed into a limitation of the atonement, but hath in it the following words, in which the universality of the sacrifice offered by Christ is recognised:

* In proof of this, *vide* Wodrow's Dedication of his History to the King.

† Palatine Catechism.

"But yet we avow that he remained the only well-beloved and blessed Sonne of his Father, even in the middest of his anguish and torment, quhilk hee suffered in bodie and saule to mak the full satisfactioun for the sinnes of the people."* A Latin translation of this Confession was executed, at the desire of the Kirk, by Patrick Adamson, in which the words now founded upon are thus rendered: "Ut peccata hominum plene lueret."†—There is an older Confession—that "used in the English congregation at Geneva, received and approved by the Church of Scotland in the beginning of the Reformation," which, though afterwards superseded by that of 1560, is not unimportant in reference to the present question, inasmuch as it was the Confession that must have been previously used by John Knox and other compilers of that of 1560—it thus speaks of the work of Christ: "Thus of his free mercie, without compulsion, he offered up himself as the onlie sacrifice to purge the sins of all the world."

On the whole subject of the views entertained of the work of Christ, both in the churches of England and Scotland, *up* to the time, and *at* the time of the drawing up of our present Confession,—there is an important evidence of the fact, that there was in no quarter any limitation of the extent of the atonement, furnished to us in the readiness with which the members of the Church of England, who held its extent so explicitly, signed, along with their brethren of Scotland, the National Covenant, in which the existing doctrine of the Church of Scotland is so distinctly recognised; while the only points of discussion which seemed to arise at their signing of the Covenant, were those which arose upon the subject of Church Government.

I trust, then, that it has been made abundantly manifest, that there is no apology for conceiving of our Church as having at any time, either in the wording of her Standards,

* Article IX. † *Vide* Dunlop's Collection of Confessions, vol. ii.

or in the meaning of those who drew them up, denied the universality of the atonement.

Second. In respect to the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation. While there is not, for the reason assigned above, much *direct* statement on the subject to be found in the Scriptures, the records of the Protestant Church peculiarly abound in pointed and strong testimonies in its favour; insomuch that it is far easier to multiply proofs that the Protestant Church has everywhere held, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and that personal confidence towards God, as the forgiver of our sins, is *inseparable* from the reception of the Gospel, than that they held THAT doctrine of Universal Atonement and Pardon through the death of Christ, which alone furnish a reasonable foundation for such assurance.—The explanation of this fact is, that the error of the Roman Catholic Church was not the limitation of the death of Christ, as to extent, but the denial that the knowledge of it was enough to perfect the conscience, and give peace and confidence towards God: therefore the Reformers were at peculiar pains to vindicate the sacrifice of Christ from the imputation of incompleteness, which the Popish doctrine of a necessity for some additional ground of peace, cast upon it: and it is striking, and most instructive, to find the same kind of reasoning, which I have already noticed in speaking of the pardon of sin, as made use of by the Apostle, in the tenth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, adopted in arguing against the sacrifice of masses, and every thing else by which the all-sufficiency and completeness of the one oblation offered by Christ upon the cross, was brought into question—the Apostle argues, sacrifices are not repeated because this one sacrifice has put away all sin, so that there is no longer any sin standing in need of remission—*they* argued that sacrifices of any kind ought not to be offered, because the "*offering of Christ was that perfect redemption,*

propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual."

The one point of doctrine, indeed, which marks the Reformation, and which was the basis of the Protestant Church, was the all-sufficiency of the knowledge of Christ crucified to give peace of conscience, and assured confidence towards God. The Confessions of Faith which the several branches of the reformed Church drew up, all record this fact. And seeing how later Confessions have ever been received as in nothing contrary to those which had preceded them—and seing how the Reformation Church conceived of herself as one Church, in respect of doctrine (while reluctantly recognising a diversity in Church Government), I would feel it no irrelevant argument in this present question to quote the authority of the Reformed Church, as a body, establishing what that authority sanctioned by the language of the various Standards.

It may be sufficient, however, to refer to what are peculiarly the Standards of our Church: and as I see that in the Act of Assembly 1720, the chapter in the Westminster Confession, on the subject of Assurance of being in a state of Salvation, as quoted with application to the subject of Assurance of Faith, I would remind my brethren, that it is the subject of Assurance of FAITH, that, at present engages their attention.

The following is the definition of Faith in the Westminster Confession, chap. xiv. sect. 2, "By this faith the Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of God himself speaking therein; and acteth differently upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life and that which is to come. But the principal acts of saving faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sancti-

fication, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace."

It is manifest, that here, faith is the believing to be true whatever God hath spoken, with that assurance of its truth which corresponds with its authority, as spoken by God himself; and that this belief is supposed to be accompanied with the feelings which the thing believed is fitted to awaken; and more particularly, in respect of Christ, the feeling of accepting, receiving, and resting upon him for justification, sanctification, and eternal life."—There is here no colour given to the distinction, commonly made, between doubting God and doubting ourselves. The promises are evidently supposed, being believed, to inspire the confidence which they were intended to impart; and, although the expressions which follow, as to degrees of faith, and the assaults to which faith is exposed, may seem to give some sanction to the apology made for living in uncertainty as to God's love and favour towards us; yet, being rightly considered, do they imply nothing more than that liability to sin against God, by doubting his word, of which all the children of God are conscious, and which they daily lament, with confessions, far removed from the ignorant and self-complacent feeling with which uncertainty of the love of God, and of a personal interest in the work of Christ is avowed, by persons professing the most unhesitating confidence in the truth of the word of God, and so exculpating themselves altogether from the charge of unbelief, or even weakness of faith; while they insinuate that their want of assurance arises from their humble estimate of their own religious attainments.

The definition of the Larger Catechism asserteth, "that, in justifying faith, there is not only an assent to the truth of the promise of the Gospel, but a receiving and resting upon Christ and his righteousness therein held forth, for pardon of sin, and for the accepting and accounting of his

person righteous, in the sight of God, for salvation." —And in the Shorter Catechism we are taught, "that we receive and rest upon Christ alone for salvation, as he is offered to us in the Gospel."—The words, "receiving and resting," thus occurring both in the Confession and in the two Catechisms of our Church, if we attach their natural meaning to the words, certainly teach us that assurance is of the essence of faith—to hold otherwise, is to hold that we may receive Christ as a Saviour and yet not put trust in him *as one*—yea, that we may *rest* upon him, and yet it be no rest.

But lest there should be any hesitation in recognising this as the true interpretation of our later Standards, let us consider the older ones, with reference to which they were received "as being in nothing contrary" to the previously received doctrine of the Church.

"Regeneration is wrocht be the power of the Holy Ghost working in the hartes of the elect of God *ane assured faith* in the *promise* of God reveild to us in his word, by whilk faith we apprehend Christ Jesus with the graces and benefits promised in him."—*Old Confession Art. 3.*

In Calvin's Catechism—used by the Church of Scotland and approved by the first Book of Discipline—a question is put, What is further required besides our placing confidence in God, and having an assured knowledge that he is Almighty and perfectly good? The answer is in these words, "That every one of us be *fully assured* in his conscience *that he is beloved of God*, and that he will be both his Father and his Saviour." Again, it thus defines "*a right faith*:" It is "a sure persuasion of God's tender love towards *us*, according as he hath plainly uttered in his gospel, and that he will be both a Father and a Saviour unto us through the means of Christ."

In the Palatine Catechism already referred to—in answer to the question, "What is true faith?" it is replied, "It is

not only a knowledge, by which I steadfastly assent to all things which God hath revealed unto us in his word, but also an *assured affiance,* kindled in my heart by the Holy Ghost, through the gospel, by which I *rest* upon God, *making sure account* that forgiveness of sins, everlasting righteousness, and life, is bestowed *not only* upon *others, but also upon me,* and that freely, by the mercy of God, for the merit and desert of Christ alone."

In the Solemn League and Covenant there is this declaration, "We detest and refuse the usurped authority of the Roman Antichrist—his *general and doubtsome faith.*"

And after these quotations from the authorised standards of our Church, I may surely ask my Brethren to come to this conclusion, that to preach and to teach the doctrine, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, is in no respect to do any thing inconsistent with the obligations under which I have come, as a minister of the Church of Scotland.

I shall conclude this part of my answers to the libel, with two extracts from the writings, on this subject, of ministers of our Church; who, in teaching that doctrine of assurance for which I am now called in question, not only met with the toleration of the Church, but received the highest esteem of the most holy of her members. The first extract is from the Notes of the Rev. Thomas Boston to the Marrow of Modern Divinity. "And the doctrine of assurance or an appropriating persuasion in saving faith, as it is the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, Rom. x. 9. Acts xv. 11. Gal. ii. 20. so it is a Protestant doctrine, taught by Protestant Divines against the Papists; sealed with the blood of Martyrs, in Popish flames; it is the doctrine of reformed churches abroad, and the doctrine of the Church of Scotland."

My other extract is from the work of the late Dr. Colquhoun of Leith, on Faith. Treating of assurance, he says —"There are two different kinds of assurance, the assur-

ance of *faith* and the assurance of *sense*. The former kind belongs to the *essence* of faith. It is *essential* to saving faith, and is nothing but faith itself." Again, "This particular trust, or confidence in the Saviour for Salvation, is what our Reformers from Popery called the *assurance of faith:* and *by it* they usually describe saving faith."—"For my part," says he, "I am utterly at a loss to know what trusting in the Saviour for salvation can mean, unless it means my *trusting that he will perform the part of a Saviour to me.*"

I might have quoted rather from the early founders of the Church, and in their writings I would have found expressions of the truth more entirely in harmony with those which I myself would choose—thus Patrick Hamilton, the first martyr in Scotland for the doctrines of the Reformation, says, "And they that believe not that their sins are forgiven them, and that they shall be saved for Christ's sake, they believe not the gospel." But I have chosen rather these fathers of a later age, because it is ground of much thankfulness to be able to trace the Reformation testimony down to our own time, and to know, that however much the Church hath fallen from the ground she once occupied, she has not yet interdicted any of her ministers from preaching that truth, through the faithful testifying to which she was at first brought into being, and that however much her departure from her original pure tone of feeling has been painfully recorded in the Act of Assembly of 1720, not yet testified against by any subsequent Assembly, yet hath she not as yet, by any overt act of oppression for the truth's sake brought upon herself the guilt—the highest with which as a Church she could be stained—of taking away the Key of Knowledge, not only not entering in herself, but those who would enter in, hindering—of ceasing from discharging her high office as the pillar and ground of the truth, and lending herself to Satan for the

work of darkening counsel, and shutting the mouths of those who have held forth the word of life—I say, it is cause of thankfulness that the Reformation doctrine of assurance of faith hath been even to so recent a date, preached and published by men having high esteem among her ministers.—How long such a testimony may be borne to her, it is not for me to anticipate. I desire, as a faithful son of the Church, to commit it to the Lord, who doth not visit us as we deserve, neither rewardeth us according to our iniquities.

I have now submitted to my Brethren all that appeared important to me to state upon the relevancy of this libel, in reference to the Scriptures and Standards of the Church. The importance of the subject, in every light in which I can regard it, would have justified to my mind even a more lengthened statement: the more especially that I almost take for granted that the question of relevancy will be the only question, and that there will be no occasion to lead any proof; seeing that all that is true, I am desirous myself distinctly to state. It may be, now, farther, right to take some notice of the minor proposition, and the several specific allegations into which it is broken down.

I would say, generally, that I cannot recognise the exact expressions used as having been employed by me: that some of them are *substantially* such as I might have used, and that others, I am satisfied, I have not used, and they are such as would give an erroneous conception of what I teach. The first occasion specified* is my preaching in the Floating Chapel in Greenock, in April last; on which occasion I did fully set forth the doctrine which I have already stated in these answers, both with regard to pardon and judgment; but I cannot know, with any certainty, whether in the words quoted in the libel. The same sermon is largely quoted from under the Tenth Count, and

* Counts 1st and 10th.

will be seen by the reverend Presbytery to have within it evidence, that to a considerable extent is likely to be accurate, seeing that it so far harmonizes with the doctrines which I have stated myself to hold and teach—but as my sermons have been for a considerable time past, preached without any previous writing, my brethren will not be surprised that I can make no more pointed reply to these charges.

The Second Count refers to the sermon which I preached by appointment, before the Reverend Presbytery, the 8th of July last. The first two statements ascribed to me, are similar to those which I have already admitted in Presbytery, so far as I recognise them—the third statement distinctly conveys an idea, which I did not express or entertain.

The third count seems to me in every part of it to be untrue, some of the words or members of sentences seem not unlike such as I may have used; but the ideas conveyed by the sentences, taken entire, are such as I have never taught.

The Fourth Count I do not recognise in words; and in so far as it is true, it corresponds with what I have stated above on the subject of assurance of faith.

I do not recognise the Fifth Count, nor do I believe that I have ever so expressed myself.

As to the sixth count, I do not admit what is here charged unless the Reverend Presbytery will understand, the testifying to the people, that none ought to go to the Communion table, unless they were in a condition to commemorate the love of Christ, as love to themselves individually, to be tantamount to it.

The Seventh Count begins with a statement which I do not recognise; but I am not certain that I may not have used words not unlike these—but the second statement I utterly deny.

The Eighth Count contains a statement which I never made.

I do not recognise all the statements in the *Ninth* Count, indeed not one of them is precisely such as I would have made; and though I can gather from them, what the doctrine was, that I must, on that occasion, have been setting forth, I am certain these expressions do not, accurately or truly, convey what was taught.

The Tenth Count has been noticed already along with the first.

Upon the whole, I do not know that any of the expressions contained in the minor proposition of this libel would convey, by themselves, an accurate conception of the doctrines which were taught, on the occasions on which they were said to have been used; but having taken notice of them all, with as much precision as the case admits of, I now leave the whole matter in the hands of the Reverend Presbytery, looking to God, with earnest prayer, that they may be enabled to deliberate in this most important matter for the glory of God, and the good of his Church.

In respect whereof, &c.

JOHN M'L. CAMPBELL, Minister of Row.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PRESBYTERY OF DUMBARTON.

At Dumbarton, the twenty-first day of September, one thousand eight hundred and thirty years.

After prayer by Mr. Carr, Moderator,

Sederunt—Messrs. Wilson, Graham, Hamilton, Gregor, Proudfoot, Story, Jaffray, A. Sym, Coltart, Lochore, Niven, Campbell, and Fleming, Ministers; with Mr. Dunlop, Elder, from Cardross, and Mr. Peter Jardine from Dumbarton.

(*Inter alia.*) The Clerk reported that he had sent Mr. Campbell a copy of the libel given into the Presbytery by Mr. M'George, with the list of witnesses, and a copy of the productions in aid of proof.

The Presbytery officer produced a written execution of summons against Mr. Campbell to this diet, bearing date the ninth day of September, current—subscribed by the officer and two witnesses to the delivery of said libel, with the list of witnesses subjoined, and a copy of the productions, in aid of proof, which was read, and is *in retentis.*

The officer was then ordered to call the Rev. John M'Leod Campbell, Minister of Row. Mr. Campbell accordingly appeared for himself. The libellers of Mr. Campbell were then called. Compeared Messrs. John Thompson, A. Lennox, George M'Lellan, and Peter Turner; with Mr. M'George, as their agent.

The libel was then read over, when Mr. Campbell gave in written answers to said libel, which were read, and ordered to be kept *in retentis.*

Parties were then heard on the relevancy at full length, and removed.

The Presbytery having considered said libel, and being well and ripely advised, did, and hereby do find the major proposition of said libel relevant.

Parties being called in, this judgment was intimated to them.

From which judgment Mr. Story dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, for reasons to be given in, in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

Against which judgment, Mr. Campbell protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, for reasons to be lodged in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

In the above judgment, Mr. M'George, in name of the libellers, declared his acquiescence, took instruments, and craved extracts.

It being now past seven o'clock, the Presbytery agree to adjourn till to-morrow morning, to meet in the same place, at ten o'clock—to which diet Mr. Campbell and the libellers were summoned *apud acta* by the Moderator.

Reasons of Protest and Appeal, by John M'Leod Campbell, Minister of Row, against a judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, pronounced on the twenty-first day of September, one thousand eight hundred and thirty years, relating to a Libel against the Appellant, at the instance of George M'Lellan, and others, designing themselves heads of families, and inhabitants of the parish of Row, by which judgment the Presbytery found the major proposition of said Libel relevant.

I. There is an indefiniteness in the proposition thus found relevant, in that while it states certain doctrines to be contrary to the Scriptures and the Standards of the Church, it does not specify passages in the Scriptures, or in the Standards, in proof of this assertion;—which occasions the greater ambiguity, inasmuch as the Standards of the Church nowhere define or even employ the terms in which this proposition is expressed. It becomes, therefore, an important objection to the judgment of the Presbytery, that it simply finds the pro-

position in question relevant, without adding such explanations as would make it apparent in what sense the Presbytery understood its terms, or on what grounds, in reference to the Scriptures and the Standards, they held it to be relevant.

II. In the Answers to the libel, which were given in to the Presbytery, various senses in which some of the terms of this proposition have been employed were stated—and the admission made, on the part of the appellant, that taking these terms in some of these senses, the proposition *was* relevant; while taking them in other of these senses, it was submitted, that it was *quite irrelevant* and *untrue*. Hence arose a further and very imperative reason, why the finding of the Presbytery ought to have been more explicit;—and the appellant feels aggrieved, in that, at this moment, he does not know in what sense the Presbytery have understood this proposition, while declaring it relevant as the major proposition of a libel concluding for his deposition from the Ministry.

III. Assuming the interpretation of the terms of this proposition, according to which the appellant has admitted, in the Answers to the libel, that it states doctrines which he holds and teaches, to be that adopted by the Presbytery in pronouncing the judgment appealed from, then, in that case, that judgment is objected to and appealed from, and held to be one which the superior Court ought to reverse, inasmuch as it declares doctrines to be contrary to the Scriptures and the Standards of the Church, of which it may with truth be said, that they are what the Scriptures principally teach—and that they are not only not contrary to the Standards, but are implied in, and are the basis of all that they teach and set forth as the life of God in man.

In respect whereof, &c.

(Signed) JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL,
Minister of Row.

Row, October 1st, 1830.

At Dumbarton, the twenty-second day of September, one thousand eight hundred and thirty years.

After prayer by Mr. Carr, Moderator, the Presbytery met, pursuant to adjournment.

Sederunt—Messrs. Graham, Hamilton, Gregor, Proudfoot, Story, Jaffray, A. Sym, Coltart, Lochore, Campbell, and Fleming, Ministers; with Mr. Dunlop, elder from Cardross.

Minutes of yesterday's Sederunt were read.

The Presbytery resumed consideration of the case from Row.

Parties being called, compeared Mr. Campbell for himself.

Of the libellers, there compeared Messrs. Geo. M'Lellan, and John Thomson; with Mr. M'George, as their agent.

The libel was again read over, with Mr. Campbell's answers to the different articles.

The Presbytery agree to consider the counts of said libel *seriatim*.

The first count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said first count relevant, with the exception of the proposition "there could be no judgment to come, unless there had been pardon to come."

The second count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said second count relevant, with the exception of the proposition—"in speaking of the words in the fifth chapter of Matthew's Gospel, 'Blessed are they that mourn:' you said that the causes of this mourning were not within the believer, his sins having been taken away, but they existed outwardly in the unbelief and sinfulness of the world."

The third count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said third count relevant.

The fourth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said fourth count relevant.

The fifth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said fifth count relevant.

The sixth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said sixth count relevant.

The seventh count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said seventh count *not* relevant.

The eighth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said eighth count relevant.

The ninth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the said ninth count relevant, with the exception of the propositions—" that the curse in Adam extended only to the death of the body, and takes effect upon all;" and " that if Christ had not died, mankind would not have risen, nor would they have gone to hell, to eternal punishment, but to Hades."

The tenth count was then read over, with Mr. Campbell's answer.

The Presbytery find the following proposition in said tenth count, *videlicet:* " Now, inasmuch as it is true concerning you, that in the first place the work of God in Christ has put away your sins, so that it is the fact, that your sins are at this moment not imputed to you"—taken in connexion with the following—" that sinners as you are, that deserving of condemnation, and by nature under condemnation as you are," is relevant, as is also the proposition ; " that the principle upon which Christ judges the earth, is, that Christ has redeemed us;"—and also the propositions, " that the judg-

ment presupposes forgiveness ;" and " that it is as those who have been forgiven that we judged shall be." Find the other propositions of the said tenth count *not* relevant.

From the above findings of the Presbytery, Mr. Dunlop dissented. Mr. Story also dissented, and protested for leave to complain to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, promised to give in his reasons in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts. Against the above findings, Mr. Campbell protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, promised to give in his reasons in due time, took instruments and craved extracts.

In which findings, Mr. M'George, in name of the libellers, acquiesced, took instruments, and craved extracts.

The Presbytery appoint the Moderator, and Messrs. Graham, Hamilton, Fleming, and A. Sym, a Committee; Dr. Fleming, Convener, and three a quorum, to answer Mr. Campbell's Reasons of Appeal, and Mr. Story's Dissent and Complaint, and to defend the judgments of the Presbytery at the bar of the Synod.

REASONS of PROTEST and APPEAL, by JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL, Minister of Row, against the judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, pronounced on the 22d day of September, 1830, in reference to the libel against the Appellant, at the instance of George M'Lellan, and others, designing themselves heads of families, and inhabitants of the parish of Row, by which judgment the Presbytery found the several counts of the minor proposition of said libel, with the exception of a few sentences, relevant.

Having, in the Answers to the libel, stated generally, of its minor proposition, that none of its counts did truly and intelligibly, and without explanation, convey the doctrines which were taught on the occasions on which the several expressions quoted are said to have been used; and having given a particular denial to most of these expressions, it is

manifestly not incumbent upon the appellant,—nor indeed consistent with the ground which he has thus taken, that he should minutely consider whether expressions which he has never used, and which can at the most be but imperfect quotations, are, or are not, relevant to prove any thing. Yet there are, without so examining the minor proposition, certain reasons of appeal against the Presbytery's judgment, as one by which the Appellant is aggrieved.

I. Assuming the objections taken against the indefinite character of the Presbytery's judgment, in reference to the major proposition, to be just and tenable, then the Presbytery were not in a condition to proceed to a consideration of the relevancy of the minor, without doing injustice to the appellant. It is manifest that if it is impossible to know certainly what the Presbytery understand to be contained in the major proposition, while finding it relevant, it must be also impossible to know what the precise charge is, which the minor is found relevant to prove:—so that the appellant may truly say, that he does not know what the minor proposition is intended to prove against him, or what the charge is, which he has to meet.

II. The judgment now appealed from, is not only one thus placing the appellant *substantially* in the situation of being subjected to a trial on an unknown charge,—that is substantially without being libelled, but in so far as the Presbytery's understanding of the major proposition may be gathered from their judgment on the minor, and the charge which they contemplate thus inferred, the appellant objects that the interpretation which seems put upon the major is altogether inadmissible, and consequently the judgment now appealed from unwarranted. In the findings relative to the minor proposition, it appears to be the assurance of being in a state of salvation that the Presbytery are contemplating—while there is no mention of that doctrine in the major proposition, which refers to no assurance but that known by the name of

assurance of faith. This appears to the appellant a most insuperable objection, inasmuch as it makes the charge sent to proof, so far as it can be understood, not the charge libelled at all.

III. While there is thus not only want of definiteness, but also important misconception in the Presbytery's judgment, in that the minor proposition of the libel is found relevant to prove what is not stated in the major, there is a still further proof of misconception furnished by the consideration of a part of that matter which the Presbytery have cast out of the minor proposition as irrelevant. The greater proportion of the tenth count is thrown out. Now this tenth count contains the nearest approximation to an intelligent statement of the doctrines taught by the appellant to be found in the libel, and therefore ought to be the most relevant, if the major proposition be understood in that sense, according to which the appellant has admitted that he holds and teaches the doctrines which it states. This is an important fact;—and the consideration of it, and of the manifest misconception on the subject of assurance, must surely satisfy the superior Court, that the objections taken to the Presbytery's judgment, in respect of want of explicitness, is not urged in any captious spirit. Substantial justice is all that is sought—but proceeding with the trial in such darkness, and under such misconception, the Appellant may eventually find himself deposed from the Ministry for teaching, not only what he never held, but what he never has been libelled for holding.

In respect whereof,

(Signed) JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL.
Minister of Row.

Row, October 2d, 1830.

At Dumbarton, the fifth day of October, one thousand eight hundred and thirty.

After prayer by Mr. Carr, Moderator,

Sederunt—Messrs. Wilson, Graham, Hamilton, Gregor, Proudfoot, Story, Jaffray, A. Sym, Coltart, Lochore, Niven, Campbell, and Fleming, Ministers; with Mr. Dunlop, Elder, from Cardross, and Mr. Peter Jardine from Dumbarton.

(*Inter alia.*) Mr. Campbell being judicially asked if he adhered to his Answers to the libel given in against him, declared he did adhere to the same.

Being asked if he had any addition or explanation to make to these Answers—replied, that understanding this question to have reference to his personal judgment of the explicitness of his answers, and not to any call for explanation that has subsequently arisen in the misconception of the Court, and with reference to which he has appealed, he does not feel it needful to add any explanation, while he will be happy to meet any desire for explanation on the part of any of his brethren, and answer any question which such desire may prompt.

The Presbytery then proceeded to read certain passages from the Answers given in by Mr. Campbell, viz. page 22* beginning with the words—"as to the extent of the atonement;" and ending with the words—"without distinction:" page 114—"I hold and teach," to page 115—"then does there lie a just charge against me:" page 116—"those likewise," &c., to page 119—"rejecting God's truth"—in connexion with the fifth Act of the General Assembly, held at Edinburgh in 1720—and the texts of Scripture and the declarations of the Standards of the Church referred to in the aforesaid act.

The Presbytery delay taking any farther step in the cause till their first ordinary meeting in December.

* Pages 15 & 16, 45, 46, and 47, of the printed copy of the Answers, &c.

At Dumbarton, the seventh day of December, one thousand eight hundred and thirty.

After prayer by Dr. Graham, Moderator,

Sederunt—Messrs. Wilson, Hamilton, Proudfoot, Story, Jaffray, Carr, A. Sym, Coltart, Lochore, Niven, Campbell, and Fleming, Ministers; with Mr. Dunlop, Elder, from Cardross, Mr. Speirs, from Fintry, and Mr. Coll Smith, from Luss, who produced commissions from their respective Kirk Sessions.

(*Inter alia.*) The Presbytery resumed consideration of the case of Mr. Campbell of Row.

Parties being called, compeared Mr. Campbell for himself. Of the libellers, there apppeared Messrs. Parlane M'Farlane, and Aulay Lennox; with Mr. A. M'George, jun. who produced a mandate from the libellers.

After mature deliberation, the Presbytery resolved to proceed to the probation of the libel: against which resolution, Mr. Campbell protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, promised to give in his reasons in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

The Presbytery admit to proof, such parts of the libel as were found relevant at their meeting on the twenty-second September last: grant the defender a conjunct proof of all facts and circumstances tending to exculpate or alleviate: allow him to lodge a list of witnesses to be adduced in exculpation with the Clerk of Court, on or before the last Tuesday of January, and allow the libellers a copy of such list: grant warrant to the Kirk officer of Row, who is hereby specially constituted Presbytery officer to that effect, to summon said witnesses, together with the witnesses in the list given in for the prosecutors, or such of them as they shall insist on, to compear before the Presbytery at the Bath's Inn at Helensburgh, on the third Tuesday of February, with continuation of days:—On which day the Presbytery resolve to meet at twelve o'clock, noon, to lead a proof, and take what further steps they may find just in this cause: And

the Presbytery further appoint their Moderator to write to the Moderators of neighbouring Presbyteries, requesting them to grant warrant for summoning such witnesses adduced by either party, as are not resident within the bounds of this Presbytery. Which judgment was intimated to the parties.

In the above judgment, Mr. M'George, jun. in name of the libellers acquiesced, took instruments, and craved extracts.

REASONS of PROTEST and APPEAL by JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL, Minister of Row, against a judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, come to on the seventh day of December, current, by which judgment the Presbytery resolved to proceed to a probation of the libel against the Appellant, at the instance of George M'Lellan and others, designing themselves heads of families and inhabitants of the Parish of Row.

In taking the protest for which I am now to assign reasons, it is quite manifest that I cannot have been influenced, either by the desire of protracting proceedings, or of preventing investigation, seeing that the instructions from the General Assembly, under which the Presbytery are acting, put it out of my power to prevent or even to delay any measure which appears to the Presbytery expedient.

The Assembly's instructions, whatever other effect they may have upon the history of this process, certainly save any protest that I may take in the course of it, from being liable to the complaints to which such steps on the part of the prosecuted party are usually exposed.

All I do, or can contemplate in taking such a protest, is to have the opportunity of recording my conceptions of the step which the Presbytery have adopted; and doing so, in such a shape, and at such a point, as will bring the matter under the view of the superior Courts, in the way best fitted to enable them to do ample justice in reviewing the whole case.

Of the reasons which compel me, however reluctantly, to feel dissatisfied with the judgment of my brethren, some are the same that have been already recorded as the grounds of objections to the first judgments pronounced in this process. The other additional reasons I would now respectfully state —not again recurring to the objections taken against the judgments on the relevancy, further than saying, that they must manifestly remain as objections to every subsequent step in the process, seeing that they amounted to this, that " proceeding with the trial in such darkness, and under such misconception, the appellant may eventually find himself deposed from the ministry, for teaching not only what he never held, but what he never has been libelled for holding."

I. In the form of process, chap. vii. sec. 5, it is provided that if the Presbytery find the libel relevant, and that there is cause to insist, they are to endeavour to bring the accused party to a confession, whereby he may most glorify God. Acting upon this as the law of the Church, the meeting of Presbytery of the 5th of October last, was appointed for the purpose of holding a conference with the appellant, and of that meeting the following is the record :—

" Mr. Campbell being judicially asked if he adhered to his Answers to the libel given in against him—declared that he did adhere to the same. Being asked if he had any addition or explanation to make to these Answers—replied, that understanding this question to have reference to his personal judgment of the explicitness of his Answers, and not to any call for explanation that has subsequently arisen in the misconception of the Court, and with reference to which he has appealed, he does not feel it needful to add any explanation, while he will be happy to meet any desire for explanation on the part of any of his brethren, and answer any question which such desire may prompt.

" The Presbytery then proceeded to read certain passages from the Answers given in by Mr. Campbell, viz. page 22,

beginning with the words, ‘ as to the extent of the atonement’—and ending with the words, ‘ without distinction’ page 114, ‘ I hold and teach,’ to page 115, ‘ then does there lie a just charge against me;’ page 116, ‘ These likewise,’ &c. to page 119, ‘ rejecting God’s truth.’ In connexion with the Fifth Act of the General Assembly, held at Edinburgh in 1720, and the Texts of Scripture, and the declarations of the Standards of the Church referred to in the aforesaid Act.”

Now, bearing in mind the object of this conference, viz. to bring the accused party to a confession, it seems a fair representation of the *res gesta*, as recorded above, to say, that my adherence to the Answers was regarded as a confession, that the further question as to whether I had any explanations or additions to make, was put, both as giving an opportunity of qualifying my statements, which, it might be held, was due, in fairness to their accused brother, and as fixing the character of the Answers as a final confession, if no explanations were offered—that the feeling on the part of the Presbytery as to the distinctness of their own apprehension of the doctrines charged, and as to the distinctness of the avowal of the truth of the charges was such, that there was no inclination to take advantage of the invitation given to put questions, if explanations were felt needful—and that the collation of certain passages in the Answers, with passages in the Scriptures, and in the Confession of Faith, referred to in the Act of 1720, was intended to fix the character of the former as a confession of a charge which the Presbytery had already found relevant.

But whatever may be said as to the clearness with which the record can bear this commentary, it will be in the recollection of the Members of Presbytery who were present, that it is a fair statement of the feeling which actually did prevail in the Presbytery at the time. And certainly nothing but its appearing superfluous could be a reason why the Presby-

tery should not have recorded, in so many words, whether the object of their meeting had been accomplished, and whether they had brought me to a confession, or had not.

Again. In the form of process (chap. vii. sec. 7,) directions are given as to the course to be adopted in proceeding to probation, when, after the relevancy has been found, the accused party denies the fact, obviously implying that it is only when the charge is denied, and every attempt to bring to confession has proved unsuccessful, that a Presbytery is to proceed to probation. According to this principle, we must regard the resolution of the Presbytery to proceed to probation as the same thing with a declaration by the Presbytery, that, in this case, the charge made, has been denied.

This, then, is my first objection, viz. the manifest inconsistency between the proceeding of Presbytery, on the 5th October, and the judgment now appealed from. The former seeming to imply that the Presbytery held me confessed as to the charges brought against me—the latter seeming to imply that they regard me as denying these charges. These, indeed, are but inferences; but they are inferences fairly drawn; and, further, the necessity for drawing inferences arises from the absence of explicit statements on the subject—a circumstance which can admit of no right explanation, but in the clearness with which these inferences follow; for it would be manifest injustice in a Presbytery purposely so to word their minute, as to make it impossible for the accused party to know the footing on which he stands, or the estimate that is formed by his Judges of the answers to the charges brought against him, which he has lodged with them.

I therefore feel that this case would not rightly be sent to proof until the proceeding of the Presbytery on the fifth October was in some shape reversed, and until there was a distinct finding of the Presbytery that the charges made had been denied.

II. When a party accused of teaching doctrines, held to be

heretical, denies the fact of his teaching these doctrines, then, of course, a Presbytery are placed under the necessity of proceeding to probation; but it is manifest that it is regarded by the Church as much more desirable that the party should fully admit and confess what it is that he teaches, and so relieve the Presbytery from the comparatively difficult work of gathering a man's doctrines from the imperfect and partial recollections of hearers; and the two-fold risk, on the one hand, of suffering heresy to go unpunished from lack of proof, or, on the other, of causing an innocent person to suffer from the partial record of his teaching, which alone can be obtained by such means,—to bring them at once into the condition of sitting in judgment on the doctrine really taught.

Feeling the rightness of this desire on the part of the Church—feeling it, indeed, the way to enable my Presbytery to do me substantial justice, and above all, feeling that the only proper course for one called in question on the subject of doctrine, and who had not *himself*, but *the tenets which he teaches*, to defend, I did, as I was enabled, put my Presbytery in possession of a fair and full statement of my views of the subject in regard to which my orthodoxy had been called in question. And it did appear to me that my brethren would feel thankful that the case had been put into so distinct and tangible a shape, and would have felt that all that remained for them to do, was to apply these my Answers to the Standard of the Word of God, and decree righteous judgment, as God might give them the spirit of discernment. My second objection, therefore, to the resolution to proceed to probation is, that the course thus adopted, always objectionable when not rendered absolutely necessary, was in this case uncalled for. And that in turning away from the full statement laid upon their table, and in going to ascertain what may be gathered and authenticated of my teaching from the partial and inaccurate recollections of my hearers, my brethren are unnecessarily exposing themselves to the risk of

being led away from the true merits of the case—of making me an offender for a word—and, as regards the truth of God, of sitting in judgment on half-remembered expressions, instead of being found weighing the broad and full statement of the doctrines held.

III. In Chap. vii. sec. 8. Form of process, the following provision is made for dealing with ministers to whom a charge of heresy has actually been brought home,—" if the errors be not gross, and striking at the vitals of religion, or if they be not pertinaciously stuck unto, or industriously spread, with a visible design to corrupt, or that the errors are not spreading among the people, then lenitives, admonitions, instructions, and frequent conferences are to be tried to reclaim without cutting off." From this passage it appears that it is not so much the fact of past acts of heretical teaching, as the present state of the views and teaching of the person against whom such past acts may have been proved, that is to be considered. It is never the principle of the Church to put errors of this kind on a footing with scandalous sins, but rather to consider whether there is prospective danger in suffering the individual to occupy the place of a Teacher; therefore does she take no advantage of statements made in time past, in the way of holding a man committed, but simply seeks to be assured of the orthodoxy of a man's present faith, and of what would be the character of his teaching, if now permitted to teach.

This principle, by which the Church's conduct towards her ministers, subsequent to the proof of heresy against them, is regulated, I now refer to, as justifying the importance I have held to be due to my own statement of my views, and I would rest upon it this third Objection to the judgment appealed from, viz. that if subsequent to the unfavourable issue of a trial, an error not pertinaciously adhered to could not be made the ground of cutting me off, there is no occasion to inquire, or go about to prove whether I have ever

taught any thing beyond the statements contained in my answers. If I have never held nor set forth any thing on the subject to which they refer, beyond what they state, then they must be admitted to contain the whole case. On the other hand, supposing that any thing had been held not admitted in them, then such other matter should be made no account of, seeing that not only is it not pertinaciously adhered to, but is not now held at all.

I desire not to be understood as in the most distant way admitting that I have either held or taught any such matter, beyond the statement I have submitted to my brethren. If indeed such had been the fact of my past teaching, and that I had once held what I had subsequently seen cause to give up, I would have felt the free and full admission of my error to be my present duty to the Church of Christ. To such a duty, however, I have not, as yet, found myself called: but I suppose the case that I had held or taught any thing beyond the statements in the Answers, because though I myself know, my brethren are not called upon to take for granted that such has not been the case, and because, therefore, in objecting to their resolution to proceed to probation on the ground which I am now taking, it is incumbent on me to shew that the ends of justice do not render it imperative upon them to inquire what the fact in this respect is, for that it is quite enough to enable them to judge whether the people under my charge, and the Church of which I am a member, are entitled to expect from them that they should take any step to interrupt my ministrations,—that it is quite enough, I say, to enable them to judge of this, that they should know what, at this moment, I hold and teach.

IV. It is in the knowledge of my brethren, that some members of Presbytery, on hearing the Answers read, declared that they went farther to condemn me, than even the statements charged in the libel, supposing them proved; and that the same individuals have since stated, that, on reading

and reconsidering these answers, they have departed from this opinion. Now, this fact has furnished the Presbytery in general, and these individuals more particularly, with a striking practical illustration of the injustice to which a person may be exposed, by having his sentiments judged of from the impressions carried away by the hearers of spoken discourses. And the Fourth consideration which I present, as appearing to me a reason why the Presbytery should not have resolved to proceed to probation, is, that if any thing in the form of expression, ascribed to me in the various statements in the minor proposition of the libel, should appear to my brethren more objectionable than the statements contained in my Answers, this might have been regarded as having a satisfactory explanation in the imperfect character of that record of spoken discourses which the recollections of hearers furnish.

If persons sitting in a judicial capacity, listening, with the feeling of the responsibility of such a situation, to the reading of written defences, could take up so decidedly, and so strongly, unfavourable impressions, which on reading these same Answers again were changed, much more might it have been the case, that words might be quoted, yea honestly sworn to, from which no true estimate of the thing taught could be formed.

Lastly, It may not be improper to notice now, in conclusion, the *single ground* for proceeding to lead a proof which was mentioned in the inferior Court. It was asked, "Why say that there was no occasion to take proof, when certain statements in the minor proposition of the libel were distinctly denied?"

Acting upon the principle of fairly stating facts to the extent of my knowledge, I have said of those statements which I did not recognise, that I did not recognise them;—of those again which I knew I could not have used, that I have not used them. I so refer to these statements, not

because they went to prove something which I did not admit to be true, but just because these were the facts concerning them. And some of the statements which I have refused to recognise as mine, are not so much statements of error, as they are absolute nonsense: and others of them, although they had been used, could not be regarded as amounting to any thing more than an inaccurate and awkward expression of doctrines, which I admitted myself to teach.

But in reply to the above argument for proceeding to probation, founded on the notice which I have taken of the statements of the minor proposition, I would simply observe, that the question—the great question, in regard to which the Presbytery are seeking a sure answer—is not whether certain words in the minor proposition have been uttered, but whether certain doctrines denounced, in the major, as heretical, have been taught. When the line of defence adopted is, that the doctrines charged, admitting them to be taught, are not heretical, and objection is thus taken against the relevancy of the libel, then it becomes of no importance to inquire, whether the particular statements in the minor proposition are true or false, seeing that, supposing them to be all true, they can never be used as the proof of any charge beyond what is contained in the major to which they refer.

The occupation of time and attention on my own part, involved in conducting my defence, according to the course resolved upon by the Presbytery—my consequent abstraction, for the time, from the ordinary duties of my ministry—the occupation of the minds of my whole parish with the details of the trial—along with the evil influence in many ways likely to arise from the collisions of individuals, appearing for the prosecution and for the defence—collisions from which the most perfect integrity and honesty of purpose are no certain protection—are considerations, which, though I do not found upon them here, do still add much to my regret that my attempt to save my Presbytery, my parish, and

myself, from the evils connected with the probation of the libel, by the full statement with which I furnished my brethren, have proved unsuccessful.

In respect whereof, &c.

(Signed) JOHN M'LEOD CAMPBELL,
Minister of Row.

Kilninver, 15th December, 1830.

REASONS of DISSENT and COMPLAINT by the REV. ROBERT STORY, from a judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, at their Meeting held in Dumbarton, on the 21st of September, to the next Meeting of Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, anent the relevancy of the major proposition in the libel presented against the Rev. John M'Leod Campbell, by certain parishioners of Row.

1st, I might object to the libel generally, as containing vague and indefinite charges, clothed in words susceptible of various meanings, without specifying in what sense Mr. Campbell employed them when illustrating what he conceived to be the truth of God. Upon the principle laid down in the form of process, that since the credit and success of the gospel much depends on the entire credit and reputation of Ministers, their sound doctrine and holy conversation, no stain thereof ought to be lightly received, nor when it comes before a judicature ought it to be negligently inquired into. I hold, that unless it had contained more precise charges, it ought not to have been entertained by the Reverend Presbytery. Had the remit of the venerable Assembly, by any possible construction of the powers which it confers upon the Presbytery, released them from their duties or responsibility, as the radical Court of Justiciary, I might have acquiesced in the judgment of my brethren.

The General Assembly, however, concluding, from an *ex-parte* statement before them, (of which Mr. Campbell had no power in their presence to give any explanation,) enjoined the Reverend Presbytery to receive a libel from the complainers. In its very terms the remit implies that the Presbytery had ascertained, or would ascertain, that doctrines imputed to Mr. Campbell were the identical doctrines condemned by Act 1720; and I dissent from the judgment of the Reverend Presbytery, because, from the libel which they have found relevant, they could not so conclude by any unavoidable or necessary consequence. For although it should be found that the same words have been used by Mr. Campbell, as are employed to clothe the doctrine which that Assembly condemned, it does not follow that they denoted the same conceptions of truth. Solitary sentences, or passages, severed from their connexion, might be selected from the infallible word itself, which would seem in utter discordance with the truth which that word was intended to convey; and upon the same principle the standards of our Church might be easily proved a mere collection of heretical notions. A man must not be condemned, much less a minister of the gospel, for a word. In the mere words of every teacher, from the apostolical times until now, might be detected some damnable error; more especially all the Protestant Fathers might have been served with libels concluding for the last penalties. Luther, beyond all controversy, might have been consigned to the flames by a jury of his brother Reformers; and Calvin himself, the most exact of Theologians, might have shared the doom of Servetus.

Were it eventually found that the words imputed to Mr. Campbell in the libel, imply what the Presbytery suppose, this dissent from their judgment, it might seem expedient to withdraw; but as yet, not being able to see that they are necessarily significant of the doctrines which the Act 1720 condemned, I cannot but complain that the production of a

libel more accurate and precise in its allegations was not enjoined upon Mr. Campbell's accusers.

2d, But more particularly, I object to the major proposition of the libel, in respect of its not containing specifically libellous matter. For that alone I hold to be libellous in doctrine, which is contradictory of any declaration in the Holy Scriptures or our Standards. Were any other principle admitted such a latitude would be afforded to rash and malignant accusers, as must of necessity jeopard the reputation and usefulness of every minister of the Church of Scotland. Trials for constructive treason would not be more fatal to civil freedom, from the jealousy and suspicion of tyrannical power, than trials for inferential heresy to honest and bold teaching of truth, in seasons of ecclesiastical excitement or intrigue. Thus I express myself to guard and illustrate what I say, when I dissent from the judgment of the Presbytery anent the relevancy of the major proposition, because it does not, according to the meaning of the terms employed, necessarily contain libellous matter.

The words "Universal Atonement" and "Universal Pardon," "Assurance is of the essence of faith"—the libellers may have heard Mr. Campbell pronounce, but in what sense they do not aver, which indeed could have been known to the Reverend Presbytery only by their having specifically declared to what Scriptural truths, or Protestant doctrines, they were opposite.

3d, While I dissent and complain for the reasons already assigned, I do so further because in a certain sense the words imputed to Mr. Campbell, by the libellers, express most true doctrines, contrary neither to the Scriptures nor the Standards of our Church.

1st, With regard to universal atonement and pardon through Jesus Christ, I must premise, as they are not words of Scripture, they are not to be adopted without very special explanation. To the use of words not in Scripture I have

ever had, and now more than ever, strong objections; holding as I do, that since, on the highest authority, "the words of God are pure words, as silver tried," they are the best possible for expressing the truths which he has chosen to reveal;—nay further, esteeming as errors, not differing in kind, if even in degree of guilt, the coining of new expressions to describe more accurately the ancient truths of God, and the profane use of God's own words to clothe the novelties of human invention.

1st, But while I so express myself, and without any sanction of its use, there is a sense of universal atonement—not contrary to Scripture declarations, nor inconsistent with the Standards of our Church. It is not contrary to Scripture declarations. There are many expressions indeed in the Old and New Testament, which, without violent or unnatural construction, imply the existence of a certain relationship between Christ and all human beings, which could not be unless all, in some way or other, were affected by His incarnation, by His life, and by His death. The head of their common enemy, according to the first promise, he was ordained to bruise; in the seed of Abraham, his ancestor, according to the flesh, God himself declared all the families of the earth should be blessed—he is described as the desire of all nations, as the bearer of the iniquities of all—as the taker away of the sin of the world—as tasting death for every man. All which expressions, and many others equally emphatic, might be selected, are decisive of a wider connexion between Christ and man than could be explained by the relationship that exists between him and the chosen people of God,—unless other declarations were found by which their import could be countervailed or neutralized, they imply that something has been affected by the Saviour's dying in the common nature of man, in which men have a common interest. There is, however, neither in the Old nor in the New Testament any such expression. He is described,

indeed, as laying down his life for the sheep ; but it is a bold conclusion that no other, therefore, are interested in his death. As well might it seem, that because he took away the sin of the world, sin still remains on each individual soul. He saves only his people from their sins ; but can it follow, by any just consequence, that the guilt of those who reject him and die in their sins is not aggravated because he died ?

2d, Besides, the typical institutions devised to show forth to the ancient church the character of the Saviour's agency and his gospel corroborate the explicit declarations alluded to : thus, not to multiply examples, the lifting up of the serpent attested the possibility of cure to all who were diseased, while the atonement made every year for all the sins of all the people, was significant of the blessed truth, although sin existed communion was possible between God and man.

3d, But further, while it contradicts no divine testimony and harmonizes with gospel truth revealed in typical institutions, it is assumed throughout the whole Bible, and at every point is elucidated and confirmed by the analogy of faith. The etymology of the Saxon word atonement, adopted in our translation, for which reconciliation is sometimes synonimously used, implies the removal of an obstruction which prevented the contact, agreement, or communion of objects or agents. In this sense, atonement, as synonimous with the effect of the death of Christ, expresses the radical truth, so to speak, without which the continuance of life to man, or any communions of God with any man, would have been impossible, or be now an inexplicable mystery. Adam forfeited his life by his sin. Irrespective of God's secret counsel, or of his ultimate design in the creation of man, the legislative declaration, In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die, conclusively attested to Adam and to all, the righteous, and by God's ordinance, the inevitable desert of sin—death ; the extinction of life, by which in any or all of its senses, is implied utter impossibility of holding com-

munion with God. The fact, then, of Adam being visited not in judgment but in mercy by his Maker, revealing in promise to him, although guilty and deserving death, the bearer of iniquities and the destroyer of death, proved that, notwithstanding his sinfulness, Adam, and the human race in Adam, were placed in circumstances where that communion had not ceased to be possible. The whole of Scripture, the analogy of all the truths which scripture contains, obviously connect those circumstances and the possibility of that communion with the work of the Messiah—the bruising of the serpent's head—the atonement, and this irrespective of those ultimate distinctions which God in his eternal counsels had decreed to establish among the children of men. Those circumstances —this possibility—this reconciliation—this atonement, so different from the fixed irremediable death that had been incurred, obviously, according to the Scriptures, affects all men, *and that in virtue of Christ's agency.* In this sense, therefore, using atonement, it seems undeniable that the term universal atonement is expressive of a truth clearly revealed in the Bible, without which the race of men would have perished in the person of the first sinner, or their successive generations would have judicially been excluded without any exception whatever, from the possibility of any intercourse with their offended Creator. Now, as it appears, that in this sense, the work of the Saviour in its consequences, is not limited to those, merely, who believe in his name, but extends to all, in as much as existence could not have been enjoyed by the most godless scorner of the blood of Jesus, had not that blood been shed—even Cain the first murderer would never have been, but for the death of him who was the object of his brother's faith and hope; and he perished in his sins, not because he was doomed by inevitable and fatal necessity to that which was evil, but because, when he had shed innocent blood, he looked not to the sin-offering lying at his door, and his existence was a permanent

misery from the conviction, that his punishment was greater than he could bear; while he denied that there was forgiveness with him by whose mercy the life of his father had been saved, and in whose promises to the guilty the soul of his believing brother had found repose.

While the very existence of the race of man and of every individual of that race, in a condition intermediate between contracted guilt and its deserved infliction, of necessity implies the all-comprehensive virtue of the atonement, as already explained; so all the manifestations of God's character in the Scriptures, unite in setting forth, in illustration of the truth, that men are now, and have been ever since the fall, under a dispensation, where, at the very least, it may be averred judgment is suspended, not inflicted. For otherwise, there could be no other conclusion, than that the estate of the reprobate differed in the degree, not in the kind of its misery, while on this side the grave, and in the endurance of the second death beyond it.

2d, But the reasons why I dissent from the judgment of the Presbytery, in respect of the relevancy of the term universal atonement, will appear further from what I proceed to state concerning the term universal pardon. The term itself, I have no hesitation in unreservedly and unequivocally condemning, as fitted to mislead, as not framed to give right conceptions of the truth, either in the Scriptures or the Standards. But the truth must not suffer although arrayed in an unseemly garment, as if thereby, of necessity, it were transformed into error; for there is a sense in which all men are pardoned through Jesus Christ. They are now in a state of probation, or under a dispensation of grace, as is most clearly revealed throughout the whole of Scripture. These express the same fact or truth, and I use them as convertible terms. The continuance of being, and the possibility of communion with God, resulting from the atonement, might, or might not, have been a blessing: but the term universal

pardon implies also, that man's life was not continued to him as a curse, and that he might enjoy communion with his Maker if he willed it. If it were otherwise, the Scriptures would teach that man is necessarily, and without remedy, subjected during the whole of his being to the judicial results of the original sin ; that his continuance in sin is not because he himself will have it so—that he is in the very condition in which he would have been had Christ not died—that he is condemned now, and will be hereafter, simply because he is a child of Adam, and not as the wilful rejecter of God's grace in his crucified Son—that he is the inheritor of death, temporal, spiritual, and eternal, because, in a remote age, in the first beginning of time, his ancestor violated a law meriting that judgment ; and not that he himself has devoted the energies of his perverse and depraved mind to the perpetration of two great evils, hewing out to himself broken cisterns, and the forsaking of God, the all-sufficient good, the fountain of living waters.

Now, no truth is more clearly revealed in Scripture, than that God does not hate any of the sons of men, in the common acceptation of the term. Hatred of any object is inseparably connected in our conceptions with a desire of inflicting upon it pain—to ATTRIBUTE such a sentiment to GOD is BLASPHEMY, and cannot possibly be found among the delineations of the divine character in the records of truth. He swears by himself, by his own life, on the contrary, that he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked. The innumerable counsels, expostulations, entreaties, promises, threatenings, the Bible contains, all express the same solemn and awful reality, which imposes upon each human sinner so peremptory an obligation to return to his God and give him glory. In so expressing myself I mean to affirm, that all men, within and beyond the pale of special revelation, are utterly inexcusable in not giving glory to God ; and that at all times, and every where, according to the Scriptures, he has, in virtue

of the atonement, manifested such long suffering and goodness, as are fitted to lead all to repentance—every man, from the beginning, being placed in circumstances, sufficiently decisive of God's desire of his true happiness, to warrant his final condemnation, even although Adam and his intermediate ancestors had never sinned.

So explained, it will be seen how the present condition of the wicked being different from the future, depends upon the alleged heretical notion of universal pardon.—Why they are not now in a condition of fixed and irrevocable judgment—why there is not yet such a gulf between them and the righteous, as between Dives and Lazarus in the parable—why its insertion is delayed without compromise of his inflexible justice—that the present condition and final doom of the ungodly might unite to unfold the character of him thus described in the Psalms, "thou wast a God that forgavest them, but tookest vengeance on their inventions."

Finally, As it thus appears, unless, in a certain sense, the work of Christ be regarded as so extensive, there could be no specific difference between a human sinner and a condemned spirit, every where in Scripture represented as in very unlike conditions; as the very idea of a dispensation of grace, of which the Bible itself is a symbol or a monument, must be rejected, and the preaching of the gospel, which it bears to any but the elect, as a solemn mockery, if not a profane and presumptuous intermeddling with the purposes of God—I trust my brethren will do me the justice of saying, that while I so think and feel, I could not but dissent from their finding anent the relevancy of the first accusation in the major proposition of the libel.

3d, But further, I dissent from the judgment of the Presbytery, in respect of the utter indefiniteness of the second charge, namely, that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation, so obviously susceptible of different meanings, which itself is decisive of its irrelevancy; but more

especially, because its most obvious meaning is contradictory of no Scripture declaration. The Scriptures indeed give no declaration on the subject. If assurance, being of the essence of faith, imply any thing else, than that a mental persuasion or assuredness is identical with believing—wherever the word is used, or the idea expressed in Scripture, of necessity this assuredness or persuasion is implied, for in the Scriptures, devised to be profitable to all men, words are used with their common meaning, to express truths of common importance. In all ages, and in all languages, belief implies persuasion, so that they may be regarded as convertible terms,—of this there can be no question, as it is well expressed by a learned and profound divine of the present day, and a father of this Presbytery—" The assurance of faith," says the Rev. Dr. Hamilton, in one of his able publications, " or a clear and full conviction of the reality of the thing believed, is absolutely essential to the nature of faith. In fact, this *assurance and faith are one and the same thing*, and none who understands the meaning of the language, will ever hesitate for a moment to admit, that it is absolutely necessary to the existence of religion in the heart. *Faith, and the assurance of faith, are only two names for the same thing.*" Assuming, then, this definition of the assurance of faith to be just and true, viz. *that assurance of faith is faith*, the libellers must be held as attributing to Mr. Campbell, as a heretical notion, that faith is necessary to salvation. Is it needful to say any thing more, why I object to the relevancy of the second charge in the major, inasmuch as it contradicts no scriptural declaration, for might not the words, " without faith it is impossible to please God," quoted by any minister of the gospel, as well be incorporated in a libel, concluding for the last penalties?

4th, But I dissent further, in respect of the charges in question being in nothing contrary to the truth of the matter contained in our Standard.

While I hold that the doctrines of the Standards are truths of God, only because they are found in the Scriptures; and that the Scriptures are not to be regarded as teaching certain doctrines, merely because they are found in the Standards; it is readily admitted, that were the Standards to contain any declaration which the alleged heresies oppose, irrespective of the Scriptures, for the purposes of good order and discipline, they must be held judicially relevant to infer the conclusions of the libel. But in regard—

1st, To universal atonement in the sense already explained, I can discover nothing contradictory of the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of this Church, approven by the General Assembly, and ratified by law. For this is evident—negatively and positively, from what they do not and what they do declare.

1st, They do not declare that in no way whatever all men are affected by the death of Christ. They do not declare that the sentence was suspended in virtue of any other agency than that which was revealed in the first promise. They do not declare that men would have existed in their present condition of trial irrespective of the shedding of the blood of Christ—that the wicked or unbelieving are already in the very condition in which they are doomed to exist eternally—that men do not aggravate their guilt every moment by rejecting God's counsels against themselves, by refusing to acknowledge, in God's long suffering and kindness, what is naturally fitted to lead to repentance and salvation—that the reprobation of these who are not elected unto life, is, without any respect to their own sin, or that, by eternal and infallible decree, God is, in the same sense, the author of man's damnation as he is of man's salvation—finally, they do not declare that while here the reprobate are so doomed to unbelief, or urged to strong delusions by such necessity as would justify them in not believing in Jesus as their Saviour, or rejecting the eternal truths of God.

All which they could not avoid declaring, if they taught that in no way whatever all men were affected by the death of Christ.

2d. But, from what they do declare regarding it, it is most clear, that they contain nothing incompatible with the doctrine in question. They affirm most clearly and definitely, that "those of mankind who are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal purpose and secret counsel, and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto, and all to the praise of his glorious grace. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, fore-ordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore, they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his spirit-working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power, through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only."

Now such declarations as these, in their matter, are most true founded on the infallible oracles of God. For throughout the whole of the Confession the word Redeemed, or the idea of redemption, is never introduced without reference to the work of the Spirit in those who shall finally be saved.

If, by universal atonement in the major of the libel were meant, that all were redeemed in this sense, *or that all were equally in possession of something which Christ did to purchase, whether they believed in his name or not*, I would have no hesitation whatever, instead of dissenting from the judgment of my brethren, in pronouncing it a pernicious error—an Antinomian delusion, and striking at the very vitals of

religion. But universal atonement cannot for a moment be regarded as synonymous with universal redemption. The atonement, in the sense I have explained, having, according to the Scriptures, rendered possible communion between God and sinful Adam, while it is the very tenor by which his posterity exist in their present condition.

That the atonement, as thus affecting all, is distinct from, while not inconsistent with, the doctrine of the Standards regarding particular redemption, must be apparent from the answer to the question, " How are we made partakers of the redemption purchased by Christ? By the effectual application of it to us by his Holy Spirit."

That the possibility of the communion alluded to, or the tenor by which we hold existence, cannot be convertible with redemption, is obvious from the way it is applied by the Spirit to the soul, namely, by working faith in us, and thereby uniting us to Christ in our effectual calling.

The fact that God was pleased according to the unsearchable counsel of his will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath *for their sin*, " to the praise of his glorious justice," affects not the truth that universal atonement accords with particular redemption, meaning by this the manifestation of that work of God in Christ existing only in those who believe. For the Standards most wisely say, *that for their sin* they were ordained to dishonour and wrath, while, with consummate discretion and wisdom, they avoid expressions more particular; although beyond all controversy they cannot be held as affirming that the sin for which they are ordained to dishonour and wrath is utterly irrespective of what Christ has done for the world, or of the condition in which the shedding of his blood had placed all the generations of men.

2d, With respect to universal pardon as it has been ex-

plained, I cannot but hold that it is compatible with the doctrines of the Standards and negatives none of their declarations. Were all enjoying pardon, in the sense the word is used in those standards, no reason could have existed for any other but a unanimous judgment of Presbytery in this matter; but while I hold, that the Standards are founded upon the infallible word, I do not thereby admit that the words employed in them are words of God, or that they are at all times the best possible for clothing his truths. In these Standards, it is taught, that pardon is bestowed upon the redeemed, not for any thing wrought in them or by them, but for Christ's sake alone—not, of consequence, for the sake of their repentance, yet it is also taught that repentance is of such necessity to all sinners, that none may expect pardon without it. The pardon of the Standards expresses that which cannot be enjoyed by an impenitent mind. Of necessity, therefore, even in this life, universal pardon can have no existence so long as one prodigal of the human family has not returned to his heavenly Father. But in so limiting the meaning of pardon, the Standards of this church can never be held as excluding the idea of its universality, in the sense in which I have defined it—namely that something is done to and enjoyed by all men, in consequence of the dying of the Lord Jesus. The possibility of communion with God might have been unaccompanied with any desire for that communion on the part of God. The prolongation of life might have been without enjoyment; but the fact, that the tender mercies and loving kindnesses of God, are over all men, and that all are under a dispensation of grace, the Standards nowhere deny. They do not therefore limit to the redeemed what the Saviour hath purchased by his blood. On the contrary, there are express declarations of the Standards in which they teach, that the work of Christ extends beyond the redeemed in the procuring and bestowal of blessing. All gifts, ordinary and extraordinary, of the Holy Spirit, Christ

has received from his Father for the benefit of man; nor will it be denied, that wherever the Spirit affects any soul, it is in virtue of the work of Christ; while it is equally clear, that whether ordinary or extraordinary, every gift or influence bestowed is in itself a blessing. "For whom did the Saviour procure the Holy Spirit? for the redeemed only?" The Standards assert the contrary, and say, "that others not elected or redeemed, may have some common operations of the Spirit."

The conclusion is unavoidable, that unless the Standards held that the Holy Spirit would have strove with man's rebellious mind although Christ had not died, they thus unequivocally teach, that others than the redeemed are under a dispensation of grace—that others than the redeemed are the recipients of divine influences—influences purchased by his blood, and thus teaching that universal pardon, as it has been defined, is truly accordant with particular redemption. Now, unless these common operations of the Spirit are curses and not blessings, and that all the mercies, others than the redeemed enjoy, are expressive of hatred and not of love—of cruelty, and not of kindness in God—unless the grief so often expressed, that men should fail to turn to him their hearts, be, but as a mere rhetorical device, and not an awful reality; the Standards in so expressing the truth, coincide with the Scriptures in representing the crucified and risen Saviour as the channel of blessing, of spiritual blessing, over a wider field than the sanctuary of His elect children.

In all this, so natural for us to believe, I see clearly the doctrine of the major in the sense I have explained it—undeniably true, as it may be, in the estimation of all who have seen Jesus weeping over Jerusalem, or heard him say, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Regarding it, therefore, as most clearly admitted in the Standards, that the reprobate enjoy blessings conveyed to them through Jesus, which were impossible for them to have enjoyed, had not they been interested in the shedding of his blood, or been born under a

dispensation of grace or pardon—I cannot conclude with my brethren in the terms of their judgment, regarding the universal atonement and pardon of the libel.

3d, In respect of the second charge, I also dissent from that judgment, as nowhere do the Standards deny, that faith is necessary to salvation; a *proposition* with which, after what has been stated concerning it, *that* in the libel I am entitled to regard as identical, and, beyond controversy, not relevant to infer its conclusions.

Had the doctrine that assurance of personal salvation is of the essence of faith, been imputed to Mr. Campbell, the accusation would have been of a different complexion, as it might have seemed to justify the finding of the Presbytery, in so far as it may be held opposite to the chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith. As that, however, is not charged, but only that an assured faith is necessary to salvation, in which there is a perception of Christ's relationship to the man so believing, I must dissent from the judgment of the Presbytery regarding its relevancy, so long as I hold *that* to be a true definition of faith in our Shorter Catechism, according as it does with the use of the term in Scripture, namely, *that* whereby we receive and rest upon Jesus Christ alone for salvation, as he is offered in the gospel.

For these and various other reasons that might be assigned, and which I shall crave liberty at their bar to express, I complain and dissent from the judgment of Reverend Presbytery, to the Very Reverend the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, at their meeting, to be held at Irvine 12th of October, 1830.

(Signed) R. Story.

Dumbarton, October 1st, 1830.

What is contained on this and the preceding thirty-eight pages, is a true copy of Reasons of Dissent and Complaint of the Rev. Robert Story, against a judgment of the Presbytery of Dumbarton, of date the 21st September, 1830.

William Jaffray, *Pby. Clerk.*

PROOF FOR THE PROSECUTION

IN THE CASE OF

JOHN MACLEOD CAMPBELL,

MINISTER OF ROW.

THE REV. PATRICK BREWSTER, one of the Ministers of the Abbey Parish of Paisley, aged about forty-three, married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel, depones, that he is one of the ministers of the Abbey Parish of Paisley: Depones, that he has been about twelve years an ordained minister of the Church of Scotland: Depones, that he knows the defender: Depones, that he heard the defender preach at Row on the occasion of the presbyterial visitation in July, 1830: Depones, that he made written notes of the sermon at the time: Depones, that the defender's discourse was a lecture upon the first twelve verses of the fifth chapter of Matthew: Depones, that, upon the pardon of sin, Mr. Campbell said, that that man alone can obtain mercy, or can be saved, "who knows that God has had mercy upon him, and has forgiven him;" the words just quoted being Mr. Campbell's own words, and the previous words the import or substance of what Mr. Campbell said: Depones, that on the same occasion the defender said, that those alone bore the character of peacemakers, "who knew that Christ died for every human being," the words last quoted being Mr. Campbell's own words. Interrogated for the defender, Depones, that the words in the expression last referred to previous to the words "who knew" express no more than the import of Mr. Campbell's expression: Depones, that, on the occasion above alluded to, Mr. Campbell

A Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, for reasons to be given in in due time, took instruments, and craved extracts.

And the question being put, Depones, that in the said speech, Mr. Campbell referred to the arguments used by the essay writer, and assented to the conclusion which he, the B essay writer, had drawn from them, which was the assurance of salvation: That he then proceeded to rebut the arguments which the essay writer had produced against assurance of salvation as a primary act of faith. Re-interrogated for the defender, Depones, that the conclusion to the essay, with C which Mr. Campbell agreed, was, that assurance of salvation was inseparably connected with assurance of faith: Depones, that in rebutting the arguments in the essay to which he objected, Mr. Campbell stated that every christian must have assurance of faith; and also, that it was necessary to peace of D mind to be absolutely certain regarding the truth of the record, or that the record was a revelation from God; Mr. Campbell holding, that any degree of uncertainty regarding the truth of the record was inconsistent with the peace of mind of a christian: And that the assurance of faith had for E its object the truth of the record, as contradistinguished from the assurance of salvation; and, at the same time, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to say, that this assurance of faith implied in it assurance of salvation, and that this assurance of salvation was of the essence of assurance of faith: F Depones, that the point of agreement between the essayist and Mr. Campbell was, that assurance of salvation was inseparably connected, as an inference, with the assurance of faith: That in regard to the point of difference, the opinion expressed by the essayist was, that assurance of faith being the result G of the external evidence for the record, in conjunction with the evidence derivable from the effects of faith on the heart of the believer, the assurance of salvation could not be obtained as a primary act of faith: That the opinion expressed by Mr. Campbell was, that assurance of salvation was of the

essence of assurance of faith, and was obtained in the same act of belief: That the deponent cannot recollect all the arguments employed by Mr. Campbell to shew that it was so, but that on which he chiefly dwelt was, that it was essential to our complete peace of mind, to be assured that the evidence for the record amounted to absolute certainty.

By the desire of the witness it was here added, that, with the exception of those parts of the defender's sermon to which he has given evidence, his attention was not exclusively directed to the sermon preached by the defender before the Presbytery. Interrogated by Mr. Story, Whether the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to say, that this assurance of personal salvation, spoken of as an inference from the assurance of faith, was capable of increase: Depones, that he cannot be sure that Mr. Campbell said so in so many words, and rather thinks he did not. And all this is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) P. BREWSTER.

PETER M'LEOD, clothier in Helensburgh, aged about twenty-two, and unmarried, being solemnly sworn, examined and purged of malice and partial counsel, depones, that from September 1829 to September 1830 he generally attended the church of Row: Depones, that he took notes of some of Mr. Campbell's sermons, but did not preserve them: Depones, that Mr. Campbell frequently stated in his sermons, that Christ died for all men—for the sins of all men; that he literally tasted death for every man: Depones, that Mr. Campbell said, that in consequence of Christ's dying for the sins of all men, their sins were forgiven: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated, that the belief of God's so loving every man as to give Christ to die for every man, and consequently that his forgiving love pardoned all men through the death of Christ, and now that Christ had the Spirit for them to enable them to hold communion with God; the belief of which

introduces the mind to know the character of God, the knowledge of which is eternal life; that these were the things which Mr. Campbell said were essential for a sinner's enjoying eternal life: Depones, that Mr. Campbell said, that unless a person believed this, he did not know God, and must remain in his unsanctified state; and further, that he would be judged according to the circumstances in which he was placed by the death of Christ, and be condemned or justified according to the use which he made of these circumstances or privileges: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to say, that except a man believed these things as applicable to himself, and for himself, he could not enjoy eternal life: Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that assurance stands or falls with faith: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that when a man is fully and freely believing the whole gospel, it is impossible for him not to have at that time an assurance of his own salvation: Depones, that these doctrines were generally maintained by Mr. Campbell, and either formed the subject of his discourse, or he exhorted from them at the conclusion of his sermon, when it was an another subject.

Interrogated for the defender: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has often stated, that there was life for every man *in* Christ: Depones, that he does not recollect to have heard Mr. Campbell state, that every man had life given him *by* Christ: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated it as the object of God's forgiving love, to draw men to himself: Depones, that he stated the consequences of not coming to God: Depones, that the consequence in this life was, that they would remain unsanctified: Depones, that the consequence in another life was eternal condemnation. Being interrogated, If he recollects any particular illustration being given by Mr. Campbell of the doctrine, that all men may now come to God through Christ: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated, that the ground on which they might, was, that God had given

Christ for every man: Depones, that Mr. Campbell illus- A
trated the statement by saying, that he was commissioned to
preach the gospel, according to Christ's declaration, to every
man, and how could he do so, unless he could say that Christ
had died for every man—for that was the gospel—but that
God had so loved him as to give Christ to die for him: De- B
pones, that Mr. Campbell stated, that the way in which the
privileges of all men, in consequence of the death of Christ,
would prove their condemnation, if they did not believe on
his name, was their rejection of Christ: Depones, that at the
day of judgment men would, according to Mr. Campbell's C
teaching, be judged for their evil deeds: Depones, that Mr.
Campbell stated, that the want of assurance of salvation at
any time proceeded from unbelief of the gospel: Depones,
that in his saying, that unbelief was the cause of the want of
assurance of salvation, he implied, that it was possible for a D
believer to be at times without the assurance of salvation:
Depones, that Mr. Campbell never held out peace or security
to the careless or impenitent while they remained so: De-
pones, that he employed the terrors of the wrath to come to
awaken such persons: Depones, that he made their being E
warned of God's forgiveness an aggravation of that wrath:
Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in his sermons, did, generally
speaking, most distinctly divide between the believer and
unbeliever, and addressed them as different classes, or as such:
Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not encourage peace in any F
who did not believe the gospel, and that he laboured to
destroy all peace but the peace that arises from believing the
gospel: That Mr. Campbell was in the habit of confirming
these statements from the Scriptures in his sermons: De-
pones, that Mr. Campbell urged men to come to Christ from G
the consideration of what Christ had done for them; and that
there was no peace in remaining away from Christ—and that
there was no salvation in remaining away from Christ: De-
pones, that Mr. Campbell frequently urged repentance

A towards God, and, when speaking to christians, urged the other christian duties: That he urged the diligent use of the means of grace. Being interrogated by Dr. Hamilton, Did Mr. Campbell teach that there was any difference in the heart of God towards believers and unbelievers, with respect B to the forgiveness of their sins? Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated at a meeting in his manse, that the love which God had towards believers was a delighting of love over them, they meeting his love, and it being reciprocal; and that the love which he had towards unbelievers was a love, but not C that kind of delighting love which he cherished towards his own people: Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not say that the remission of sins was confined to believers: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, the sins of all mankind were pardoned: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that faith is D believing on the Lord Jesus Christ; and that coming to God is having that communion with God to which witness has already deponed. Being interrogated by Dr. Graham, Whether he understood Mr. Campbell to say, that the pardon of the sins of all men, both righteous and wicked, extended to E their sins past, present, and to come? Depones, that he cannot say. Interrogated, Whether Mr. Campbell was in the habit of praying for the forgiveness of sins in his prayers during divine service in the period libelled? Depones, that he does not recollect that he was, that is to say, that he does F not recollect his praying in the usual way for the pardon of sin: Depones, that Mr. Campbell said, that every believer must have a personal assurance of his salvation while he is believing the gospel: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated, that a person who never had the assurance of salvation never G fully believed the whole gospel: Depones, that in his discourse previous to the sacrament, Mr. Campbell reasoned in this way, when speaking of worthy communicants, that Christ said, "This is my body broken for you," and that the persons who could not come forward and meet this, and say,

"Yes, it has been broken for me," could not answer the end designed by the celebration of the Lord's Supper, or words to that effect. Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot, Whether Mr. Campbell stated, that repentance toward God and other duties were binding on true believers alone? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that they were binding upon all; but that only those who were true believers could perform them from a right motive.

Interrogated by Mr. Story, Whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that without repentance these duties could not be performed? Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach so: Depones, that Mr. Campbell meant by repentance a change of mind, and when alluding to religious subjects, a change from Satan unto God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that so long as the mind is not changed or regenerated, it can have no holy feeling: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that until the gospel be believed, the mind is thoroughly alienated from God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that so long as the rebellious mind is utterly ignorant of the love of God, no saving change can be effected upon it: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the knowledge of the love of God does not do away with any obligations of the law to holy obedience: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the knowledge of this holy love of God leads to all holy obedience, by their seeing the love of God to them, and consequently drawing out their love and constraining them to keep his commandments.

Interrogated by Mr. Carr. As the witness has said that Mr. Campbell taught that the sins of all men are forgiven, what it is that he exhorts them to repent of? Depones, and answers, of their wickedness: Depones, that by wickedness he means their state of rebellion and alienation from God.

Interrogated by Dr. Fleming. As the witness has said that Mr. Campbell taught that the sins of all men are forgiven, and that he taught also that men will be judged for their

A evil deeds—what are the evil deeds they are to be judged for? Depones, seeing that God has loved him, and that his sins are forgiven, that nevertheless if he do not believe, or take advantage of these privileges, at last he shall be found in a state of alienation from God, and that he will be judged B then according to his character, in as far as these privileges have or have not led him to holiness or to God: Depones, that the witness has heard Mr. Campbell say that it was not the mere pardon, but the *love* of him who had pardoned—and that a person might believe that pardon abstractly considered, C and might run to it for safety from a selfish motive: Depones, that when witness said that Mr. Campbell taught that men would be judged for their evil deeds, it was in the first place for their not seeing or not believing in this love, manifested to each individual in the world, and consequently that every D other sin followed.

Re-interrogated for the defender. Depones, that when he stated that he did not recollect to have heard Mr. Campbell pray for the pardon or forgiveness of sins in the usual way, he meant that Mr. Campbell did not couch that prayer in the usual E words: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell, on an occasion previously referred to, to state in reference to the possibility of believing in pardon from selfish motives, that a belief in the pardon of our sins, not accompanied with the discernment, or knowledge of God's character in so pardoning them, F was not true faith: Depones, that from the reasoning employed by Mr. Campbell at the time, this appeared what Mr. Campbell intended to prove: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has also stated that one who believes in the pardon of his sins without loving God and becoming like God, was not G a true believer, or did not believe the right gospel: Depones, that when Mr. Campbell said that men would be judged for their characters, deponent understood him to refer to their conduct, or to the works which constituted their character: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell pray for the for-

giveness of sins in this sort of way—forgive our want of A
love to thee, and pardon our giving thee so little glory, &c.
Interrogated what he means by &c.? Depones, that he
means our want of joy in thee, and expressions of a similar
import: Depones, that on these occasions the deponent
understood Mr. Campbell to be praying for forgiveness of the B
sins of believers: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell
pray for the forgiveness of the sins of unbelievers in this way
—"For their not seeing the redemption that is in Christ for
them:" Depones, that he does not recollect of Mr. Campbell
praying for the forgiveness of any other sin in unbelievers, C
except the sin of not seeing or of rejecting the redemption
that is in Christ: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell
state, that, in this day of grace, all sin arose from not believing
in Christ, and that the reason why they continued in sin was
that they did not believe in Christ. All which is truth as the D
deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) PETER M'LEOD.

REV. DR. ROBERT BURNS, one of the Ministers of Paisley,
aged forty-three, and married, being solemnly sworn, exam- E
ined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones,
that he has been a minister of the Church of Scotland for
twenty years: Depones, that he knows the defender. In-
terrogated whether he heard the defender preach at Helens-
burgh in September 1829; to which it was objected by F
the defender, as it was previously objected to Mr. Brewster,
that this did not fall within any of the ten instances mentioned
in the libel. And the objection being repelled, the defender
protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and
Ayr, took instruments and craved extracts. And the ques- G
tion being put: Depones, that he heard the defender preach
on the 29th September, 1829, in the school-house at Helens-
burgh: Depones, that the text was in the eighth chapter of
Jeremiah and twenty-second verse, Is there no balm in Gilead?

A Is there no physician there? Why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered? Depones, that there was very much in the sermon which struck the deponent as erroneous in point of doctrine. Interrogated whether, in that sermon, Mr. Campbell stated any thing which struck the B deponent as erroneous in regard to the matters of atonement, and pardon, and of assurance as being of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation?

Objected, that Dr. Burns, in deponing as to a sermon preached on the 29th of September, 1829, has deponed to a C sermon not contained in any one of the ten charges of the libel,—that his evidence must, therefore, be held to refer solely to the specific expressions in the previous part of the minor,—and that, while in the ten charges the libellers had left themselves the liberty of proving words having a similar D import, they have left themselves no such liberty in that previous portion of the minor, even supposing it competent to prove that portion at all, under the judgments of the Presbytery, regarding the relevancy. To which it was answered for the libellers, that where a minister is charged with hold- E ing and promulgating erroneous doctrines, it is in no case necessary to prove *the precise words* used by him. It is enough to prove the substance.

And the question being put, depones, that he is not aware that there was any thing in the sermon directly upon the F subject of assurance: Depones, that the general bearing of the discourse was in favour of the doctrine of universal pardon: Depones, that the deponent has the more distinct recollection of this sermon, as he had two conversations with Mr. Campbell on the subject in the following week, or within ten days G thereafter: Depones, that the first part of the discourse had for its object to describe man's state by nature, as requiring a physician, and the second to shew that there is balm in Gilead, and a physician there: That the objection which deponent then felt to the first part of the discourse was, that,

in describing man's state by nature, there was no reference to A
man's condition as a guilty creature in the sight of God;
but the whole design of the statement was to describe his
moral alienation from God, or his hostility to the holy cha-
racter of God: Depones, that in that part of the discourse
which described the remedy, Mr. Campbell represented God's B
reconciliation of man to himself as a past act, and as a thing
with which man now has nothing to do. That God loves all;
and that the only way in which the balm in Gilead and the
physician there can be of avail to any human being, is the
simple belief that God was reconciled to all when Christ C
died, and that he is not now imputing sin to any. That he
said in words nearly to the following effect, That it is com-
mon for the preachers of the gospel, in this country, to say,
that the reason why men do not benefit by the balm in Gilead,
and by the physician there, is that they are not sensible of D
their disease, and that they will not come to Christ for a cure.
That this is not the fact: that the true reason is that they
will not believe that God is a reconciled God to them—and
that, as such, he is not imputing transgression to them: That
all men have equally an interest in Christ, if they would truly E
allow themselves to think so; and that the reason why men
do not enjoy peace with God is that they will not rely on his
word when he says that he loves them. That in no part of
the discourse did he call sinners to repentance, or to faith,
except in the sense above referred to: And that towards the F
conclusion he used the following words, which are his very
words: "Seriousness, my friends, so far from being a symp-
tom of returning soundness, is rather a modification of the
disease." Depones, that Mr. Campbell also said, that mourn-
ing for sin, or having a sense of guilt upon the conscience, G
had nothing to do with the state of a believer's mind at the
time of his receiving the gospel: Depones, that the defender
also said that the only reason why men should be sorrowful
was that they did not believe God when he said that he

A loved them, and was reconciled to them: And the deponent understood him to say this in opposition to the causes usually assigned by Evangelical preachers in this country, viz. grief on account of sin: Depones, that on that occasion the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to state, that by the death
B of Christ all mankind were put into a state of pardon; and he stated this so fully that no one present could misunderstand him: Depones, that the defender stated the belief of this fact, viz. that all mankind were put into a state of pardon, was all that was necessary to constitute the faith of the
C gospel: Depones that Mr. Campbell stated that the reason why professors did not enjoy peace and joy in believing, was that they did not give credit to the fact that God was not imputing sin to men, and that he loved them in particular: Depones, that he understood him to say that the refusal to
D believe this fact was the unbelief condemned in Scripture, and that this was the only sin for which men, under the dispensation of grace, shall be condemned: Depones, in explanation of the date assigned to this sermon, that when he was precognosced, he was under the impression that the sermon
E had been preached in the beginning of October, but that in looking into some private memoranda on the subject, he finds that it was the 29th of September.

Interrogated for the defender.—Depones, that by seriousness he understood Mr. Campbell to mean deep sense of sin
F and anxiety about salvation, as he was speaking at the time of Evangelical preachers in this country exhorting their people to be serious: Depones, that in speaking of the sense of sin, Mr. Campbell meant merely not believing that God loves us: Depones, that the occasion above spoken to was the last
G occasion on which deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach: That he only heard him twice before—first in Greenock in 1825, and second at Port-Glasgow in May, 1827. Interrogated by Dr. Hamilton: Depones, that in Mr. Campbell's first prayer, on the above occasion, it struck the deponent

that the only sin confessed was the sin of not believing that A
God loved us, and there was, of course, no prayer for pardon
of sin, but merely for the sense of pardon, or the persuasion
that God was not imputing sin to us: And the deponent
adds, that in the second prayer the apparent deficiency did
not seem to be made up. Interrogated by Mr. Story, whe- B
ther the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean by
seriousness, all those feelings of solicitude and anxiety that
precede believing the gospel: Depones, that he understood
Mr. Campbell to mean all that solicitude and anxiety of
mind, which a man feels under the powerful preaching of the C
gospel, when he is led to inquire, What shall I do to be
saved? Again interrogated by Mr. Story: Since the Scrip-
tures declare that this is the commandment of God, that we
believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, did the depo-
nent understand Mr. Campbell to teach that all these feelings, D
described under the general name of seriousness, preceding
obedience to that commandment were sinful? Depones, that
he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that all these feelings
described under the general name of seriousness have nothing
to do with faith, in the sense in which he, the deponent, under- E
stood that term: Depones, that the deponent did not under-
stand Mr. Campbell to teach that the sense of sin, or an anxiety
to obtain an interest in Christ, had any thing to do with faith,
which he, Mr. Campbell, seemed to consider as a mere intel-
lectual act, or persuasion of the mind, that God is reconciled to F
us. Interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell
to teach that the gospel, which he was pressing upon the accept-
ance of his hearers, could be possibly believed without any
sense of sin? Depones, that the object of Mr. Campbell's
discourse did not appear to be to press the acceptance of the G
gospel upon his hearers at all, but simply to insist that they
shall believe that God is not imputing sin to them; and that
their not believing this was the only sin a sense of which
seemed to be considered by him as connected with faith:

A Depones, that Mr. Campbell represented the natural state of man as a state of moral alienation from God, meaning thereby, as he explained it, a dislike to the character of God as a holy and gracious Being. Interrogated what Mr. Campbell stated as the most likely means of overcoming this dislike? De-
B pones, that he said that it was an exhibition of the delightful truth that God has pardoned all iniquity, and is not imputing sins unto men: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to say, that the above manifestation of God's character was merely a manifestation of love: Depones, that the
C love which Mr. Campbell ascribed to the character of God was a holy love, but that the character of God as drawn by him seemed to the deponent to have excluded from it the idea of punitive justice. Interrogated, did the deponent understand Mr. Campbell to teach, that in excluding all idea
D of punitive justice from the effects of the manifestation of God's holy love on alienated minds, that these should not be permitted to endure any consequence of their guilt or sinfulness? Depones, that the deponent understood him to affirm that all the transgressions committed under the legal economy
E were forgiven, and that any suffering that was to be endured in the future world by sinners would be owing exclusively to their having rejected the gospel: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to say, that there could not be in the mind of a Christian, after the reception of the gospel;
F any mourning for sin as the procuring cause of punishment, or any fears with regard to his future state: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell as saying that the only sense of sin which ought to exist in the mind of any man, either before or after believing the gospel, was grief for
G the sin of giving the lie to God, in not believing that he loved him, and wishing to fly from him as Adam did.

Re-interrogated for the defender, depones, that the deponent did not understand Mr. Campbell in that sermon, to say, that men ought to remain easy in their sins after believ-

ing, but the tendency of the sermon, in the deponent's A
opinion, was to make men easy about sin: Depones, that the
deponent had no reason, from that sermon, to suppose that
Mr. Campbell held the doctrine of universal salvation, fur-
ther than that, in the view of the deponent, the doctrine of
universal pardon necessarily leads to that of universal salva- B
tion: Depones, that there was no specific statement with
regard to the sufferings consequent on the rejection of the
gospel, or their qualities, whether punitive or not; but he
stated that men would be rejected of God on account of
the single sin of unbelief: Depones, that in the opinion of C
the deponent, what Mr. Campbell stated in that sermon,
militated against the Scriptures, which say that men shall be
judged for every evil deed done in the body. And all this is
truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) ROBERT BURNS. D

The Rev. WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, Minister of the
Gospel, Greenock, aged twenty-five, unmarried, being so-
lemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial
counsel, depones, that he is assistant minister of the new E
parish of Greenock: Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell
preach in the month of April, 1830, in the Floating Chapel
at Greenock: Depones, that he took notes of the sermon,
and from these notes, now in his possession, he finds that
Mr. Campbell said, "Before I can say to a man fear God and F
give him glory, I must know that his condemnation is taken
away—that his sins are forgiven." "It is a fact at this
moment of every person present that his sins are put away,
and if I did not know this, I could not say to you, fear God
and give him glory, because it would be an impossibility." G
"I could not conceive any thing that I could ask of God which
he has not told me that he has already given me."—"Christ's
right to judge men is, that he has redeemed them. Judg-
ment presupposes our forgiveness. It is as persons who

have been forgiven that we shall be judged." "We cannot repent and give God glory, unless we now have forgiveness." Interrogated for the defender, depones, that the only other occasion on which deponent ever heard Mr. Campbell preach was two or three years ago in Edinburgh: Depones, that deponent took down the above notes, because the statements by Mr. Campbell, so taken down, were different from what he had been accustomed to hear on these points: Depones, that he took some other notes of the sermon, which are as follow—"To fear God is to know and delight in him. To give God glory is to praise him. The liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, is a liberty to fear God and give him glory." "This" (whereby the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean the provision for enabling men to fear God and give him glory, consisting in their sins being forgiven) "is but a part of the truth. We must know and love God's character. To this, two things are necessary—first, that God shew himself—second, that I have eyes to see him. God shews himself in Christ." Mr. Campbell also said, "The future judgment and coming wrath is that which makes God altogether lovely." Depones, that he does not recollect of Mr. Campbell speaking of responsibility of man, in the sense in which that word is commonly understood. Interrogated whether Mr. Campbell spoke of the responsibility under which man is placed by God's work in Christ? Depones, in substance, perhaps, in stating the ground of the final judgment. Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to make this the ground of the final judgment, that men had been pardoned, and had rejected the pardon: Depones, that the general connexion of the two first sentences quoted by the deponent from his notes, lay in the provision which God had made to enable man to fear him and give him glory: Depones, that Mr. Campbell's text was a passage in the fourteenth chapter of the book of Revelation, and the sixth and seventh verses. Re-interro-

gated for the libellers, depones, that he understood Mr. A
Campbell in that sermon to preach the doctrine of universal
pardon. Interrogated by Mr. Story, depones, that he under-
stood Mr. Campbell to have said in substance, that unless a
minister of the gospel knew that Christ had died for sinners,
he could not say, when preaching to the people, fear God and B
give him glory: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell
to teach that if Christ had not died for sinners, such a barrier
would have existed between God and the sinner that obedience
to the precept fear God and give him glory would have been
impossible. And all this is truth, as the deponent shall C
answer to God.

(Signed) WM. CUNNINGHAM.

It was here minuted, on the admission of Mr. Campbell,
that the three volumes entitled Numbers One, Two, and Three D
of Notes of Sermons by the Rev. J. M. Campbell, Minister
of Row, Dumbartonshire, taken in Short-hand, and published
at Greenock, and which are marked by the Moderator, are
to the best of his belief, what they profess to be.

(Signed) JOHN M'L. CAMPBELL. E

ROBERT M'FARLANE, farmer in Greenfield, parish of
Row, aged about fifty, and married, being solemnly sworn, ex-
amined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones,
that he is a hearer of Mr. Campbell: Depones, that he has F
heard Mr. Campbell, more than once, state from the pulpit,
that, in consequence of the death of Christ, our sins, past,
present, and to come, were pardoned, if we believed it: De-
pones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell say that unless a man
believes that his own sins are forgiven he makes God a liar: G
Depones, that he met Mr. Campbell in August last in the
house of John M'Farlane in the parish of Row: Depones,
that on this occasion Mr. Campbell gave the deponent a copy
of a sermon, preached by him in the Floating Chapel at

Greenock: Depones, that the copy now shewn to him, and marked by the Moderator, is the same sermon: Depones, that when Mr. Campbell gave the deponent this sermon, the deponent said he believed he had one of the same already, on which Mr. Campbell took out a copy and gave it to the witness, and said, That is one which I preached in the Floating Chapel. Interrogated by Dr. Graham: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell, in his prayers, pray for the pardon of sin, but not generally: Depones, that the deponent did not join in the sacrament at Row on the last occasion, but he was present at the sermon by Mr. Campbell previous to the sacrament: Depones, that his reason for not joining was, that he did not think he was in the frame of mind which Mr. Campbell said was necessary for partaking of the ordinance: Depones, that he does not recollect what Mr. Campbell stated in regard to the frame of mind on that occasion.

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot, whether he understood Mr. Campbell, in praying for the pardon of sin, to pray for the pardon of sins generally, or merely for the pardon of a particular sin? Depones, that the deponent understood him to pray for the pardon of sins generally. Interrogated by Dr. Graham what was his reason for not thinking that he had the character which Mr. Campbell said was necessary for joining in the ordinance? And the deponent having answered that his reason was that Mr. Campbell had stated in July, 1829, as the deponent thinks, at the dispensation of the sacrament, that no person ought to partake of the ordinance who was not assured of his own salvation, and the deponent did not think that he was in that state, and as the deponent, in his own opinion, was in the same state at the time of the sacrament in 1830, he, therefore, did not join in the sacrament on that occasion; and Mr. Campbell had not in the interval said any thing to induce the deponent to change his opinion, nor himself stated a different view of the subject from what he had stated in July, 1829. It was

here objected for the defender, that the sacrament in July, A
1829, was not within the libel,—that the evidence to be led must ultimately regard not the consequences, but the character of Mr. Campbell's teaching, within the time libelled,—and that, although it might be competent to establish the character of the teaching at the sacrament, 1830, by its con- B
sequences, it was not competent to prove the teaching at the sacrament in 1829, merely because certain of its consequences might fall within the period of the libel. The Presbytery sustained the objection; against which the libellers protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glas- C
gow and Ayr, took instruments, and craved extracts. And the deponent being again interrogated by Dr. Hamilton, whether Mr. Campbell ever stated, during the twelve months embraced in the libel, that a man might be a Christian, or a worthy communicant, without the assurance of his own sal- D
vation? Depones, that he cannot recollect. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) ROBERT M'FARLANE.

JAMES BROWNE, parochial teacher in Row, aged about 30 E
years, married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that he is the parochial schoolmaster at Row, and has been so for eight years: Depones, that he has regularly attended the church of Row since Mr. Campbell became minister, in 1825: Depones, F
that he attended church pretty regularly during the twelve months embraced in the libel: Depones, that he was in the habit of making notes of Mr. Campbell's sermons at the time they were delivered; and he is in possession of the notes of a sermon preached by Mr. Campbell at Row, on the 5th G
of September, 1830. (Objection stated to Rev. Mr. Brewster and Dr. Burns repeated.) Depones, that on that occasion Mr. Campbell said, "It has been testified to you also that you are sinners. No man naturally knows this. The

A whole natural man is one mass of rebellion. No good thing in you seen by God. It is not strange this should be unwelcome to flesh and blood. Men say they like to have their faults told them, but still they have a way of escape from the edge of the thing charged against them. This is not what
B you have been accustomed to hear, viz. the particular forms of sin, but the root of all sin. A line has been drawn between the natural man and the new man. The form in which you have been taught these truths is in the gift of Christ,—that Christ has died for every man, and if this be
C denied, then I cannot prove that God is love. If you prove that Christ only died for the elect, then from the number God has created, and has not died for them, but created them for misery, I can prove that God is hatred. The fact of Christ having died for all, teaches you that all are sinners."
D "It is the sealing of God's judgment upon them, that Christ has tasted death for every man." Depones, that what has now been stated, was the end of one head of the discourse: Depones, that under another head he said, "Farther, you have been taught that you are heirs of God. It seems strange
E that men, who are so desirous of honour, should reject this; yet there is no one thing that men hate or dislike more than when we say I am a child of God,—have the Spirit of God,—the feelings,—the mind of God,—that I am a son, to reign a king on the earth. Unless you know yourselves to be in
F this condition, you are not a child of God." Depones, that from the deponent's recollection of Mr. Campbell's sermons during the twelve months embraced in the libel, he can say that he taught that all sins were forgiven, the sin of unbelief excepted: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the love
G of God was equal to every man alike: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that Christ has died for, and redeemed every man, in the same sense: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell say, that it was a sin to pray for an interest in Christ, or something similar to that: Depones,

that the reason assigned by Mr. Campbell for this was, that A
every man had the interest he required in Christ already:
Depones, that the impression on the deponent's mind was, that
the assurance of salvation was necessary to a man's being a
Christian: Depones, that he cannot recollect whether Mr.
Campbell, during the twelve months libelled, ever illustrated B
the subject of assurance by referring to the sacrament of the
Lord's Supper: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell
say something to this effect, that a man could not be a
Christian, or in a right state, unless he were assured, that if
he were to die the next moment he would be safe or saved: C
Depones, that the deponent thinks that it is nearly the same
thing to be a Christian, and to be in a right state, and the
deponent sees no difference, so far as the preceding sentence
is concerned, between the words "safe" and "saved:"
Depones, that the deponent heard Mr. Campbell's ser- D
mon at Row, on the occasion of the Presbyterial visita-
tion in July, 1830: Depones, that the Lecture was upon the
first twelve verses of the fifth chapter of Matthew: Depones,
that the witness cannot, from recollection, say any thing as
to the contents of that sermon: Depones, that the impression E
on the deponent's mind is, that the subject of that sermon
did not lead Mr. Campbell to the subjects of universal pardon
and assurance, and that the deponent does not recollect Mr.
Campbell alluding to these subjects on that occasion.

Interrogated whether it struck the deponent that this ser- F
mon was different from the ordinary run of Mr. Campbell's
discourses, in his not treating of the subjects of pardon and
assurance? Depones, that it did not strike the deponent that
Mr. Campbell, on this occasion, entered so fully into the
subjects of pardon and assurance as formerly: Depones, that G
he has heard Mr. Campbell on former occasions discourse on
the same subjects from the same text, and in the same way.

Interrogated for the defender: Depones, that before the
8th of July, 1830, Mr. Campbell had been preaching regard-

A ing the second coming of our Lord: Depones, that there was a good deal on that subject in the sermon preached on the 8th of July, 1830, in exposition of the text: Depones, that deponent understood that Mr. Campbell was limited in point of time on that occasion: Depones, that it did not strike the B deponent that the sermon was curtailed; and he thinks that it was from an hour to an hour and a half: Depones, that Mr. Campbell is in the habit of applying his discourse to his hearers at the end: Depones, that he cannot distinctly say whether, in Mr. Campbell's sermons in general, the topics of C pardon and assurance are, or are not, more prominently brought forward in the application of his sermon to his hearers at the end, than in the rest of his discourse.

Being interrogated, if when Mr. Campbell stated that unless a man was so assured as to know that he would be D saved were he to die, he was not a christian, or in a right state before God, Mr. Campbell meant that no christian could ever be in a wrong state before God? Depones, and answers, certainly not: Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in speaking of an interest in Christ, did not mean to say, as it appeared to E the deponent, that every man had come to Christ—but that because Christ had redeemed all men, all men had equally a right and title to come to Christ.

Being interrogated if Mr. Campbell, when stating that it was a sin to pray for an interest in Christ, or words to that F effect, meant that interest which a believer, or one who knows God, has in Christ? Depones, and answers that the interest which all men have in Christ, viz. their right and title to come to Christ, is not the same with the interest of a believer in Christ, by which interest deponent understands the benefits G which the believer receives in having come to Christ.

Interrogated what the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean by the love of God to all men being equal? Depones, and answers, just that God's affection was equal to all men, and that there was no peculiar love. And by saying that

there is no peculiar love, the deponent means to refer to the A
state in which God finds the creature at first: Depones, that
Mr. Campbell taught that what was well pleasing to God in
man, was man's return to him: Depones, that Mr. Campbell
taught, as the deponent understands, that all men had not
returned to God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, cer- B
tainly, that while man did not return to God, they were not
well pleasing to him: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught
that men returned to God by faith in Christ: Depones, that
the impression which the deponent has of Mr. Campbell's
teaching, is that without faith in Christ, there can be no sal- C
vation: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught, that those who
were not well pleasing to God, would be finally damned:
Depones, that by the sin of unbelief, deponent understood
Mr. Campbell to mean man's persisting in not returning to
God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that actual sin D
flowed from the original corruption inherent in the creature
by the fall: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the
way of deliverance from actual sin was by the sanctifying
influence of the Spirit; and that without the sanctification of
the Spirit, there could be no deliverance from actual sin: E
Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach
that upon the creature believing or returning to God, *then* the
sanctification of the Spirit commenced: Depones, that Mr.
Campbell taught that Christ had redeemed every man by
the redemption price, being the same for all, and equally F
extensive: Depones, that when Mr. Campbell stated that all
men were redeemed by Christ, deponent did not understand
Mr. Campbell to mean that they were thereby to be all
finally delivered from wrath: Depones, that when Mr.
Campbell taught that Christ died for all men, he occasionally G
added, God's intention in this was that the creature should
return to God: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Camp-
bell explain the word "pardon" in preaching: That the expla-
nation was, that sin had interposed a barrier between God

A and the creature, and that by the death of Christ this judicial barrier was removed: Depones, that deponent has never understood Mr. Campbell's teaching as an encouragement to unholiness: Depones, that Mr. Campbell generally divided his hearers into classes in preaching, viz. believers and unbe-
B lievers: Depones, that Mr. Campbell assigned to unbelievers the absence of peace and joy: That he cannot distinctly recollect about his saying any thing about holiness of character on these occasions: That in regard to their conduct he cannot specify particularly, or generally, what he said.

C Interrogated by Dr. Graham: Does the pardon of sin mean the doing away the liableness to punishment as used by Mr. Campbell? Depones, and answers that such was not deponent's impression: Depones, that by the removal of the judicial barrier which deponent has already stated as the
D meaning assigned by Mr. Campbell to pardon, deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean the right and title to come to God: Depones, that the deponent cannot recollect to have heard Mr. Campbell use the necessity of the assurance of salvation in reference to the sacrament.

E Interrogated by Dr. Graham whether Mr. Campbell in his public prayers even prays for pardon of sin? To which question it was objected, that it did not fall within the minor of the libel; and the objection being answered by the libellers, the Presbytery repelled the objection, Mr. Story dis-
F senting, and the defender protested for leave to appeal to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, took instruments, and craved extracts. And the question being put: Depones, that he cannot distinctly answer as to the time, but that he has heard him do so: Depones, that the deponent cannot say that it is
G his impression that during the twelve months libelled, Mr. Campbell was in the habit of regularly praying every Sunday for pardon of sin.

Reinterrogated for the defender: Depones, that Mr. Campbell, when speaking of the right and title of all men to come

to God, meant, that they were to come from a state of alienation: Depones, that when the deponent said that Mr. Campbell was not altogether regular in praying for the pardon of sin, the deponent referred to the want of the thing, and not to the form of the expression: Depones, that the deponent does not recollect that in those prayers in which Mr. Campbell did not pray for the pardon of sin, there was any confession of sin.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that he cannot recollect whether Mr. Campbell prayed for deliverance from the power of sin.

Interrogated whether Mr. Campbell ever prayed for deliverance from the consequences of sin? Depones, that he cannot recollect.

Interrogated whether the deponent recollects about what Mr. Campbell prayed? Depones, that he cannot recollect.

Interrogated whether the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that, when he said that Christ had redeemed every man by the redemption price being the same for all and equally extensive; that there was any necessary connexion between the paying of that price and any change in the mind of those for whom it was paid? Depones, and answers that he cannot recollect. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) JAMES BROWNE.

JAMES BAIN, Student of Divinity, residing in Easterton, near Helensburgh, being examined in initialibus: Depones, that deponent resided during winter 1829 and 1830, in the house of Mr. Parlane M'Farlane, one of the libellers in this case, and was there in March 1830: Depones, Mr. M'Farlane was one who signed a memorial to the Presbytery of Dumbarton in that month, in reference to the defender: Depones, that before the memorial was prepared, deponent knew, from conversations in the family, that the memorial was to be prepared:

A Depones, that deponent neither gave any opinion or advice as to the preparation of the memorial: Depones, that the deponent in saying "as to the preparation of the memorial," he means that he neither advised that it should be be prepared, nor advised what should be put into it, as far as he can
B recollect: Depones, that he is well acquainted with six of the libellers: Depones, that until he saw the names of the libellers, at the libel now in court, he did not know from their own mouths, that any but M'Lellan and Lennox were libellers: Depones, that deponent did not construct the
C memorial himself: Depones, that deponent wrote it over: Depones, that he wrote it over before it was presented: Depones, that one evening towards the end of March, Mr. M'Lellan came to Mr. M'Farlane's house, and in presence of the deponent, produced a petition in reference to Mr.
D Campbell, and addressed to the Presbytery of Dumbarton, and stated to Mr. M'Farlane that there was to be a meeting of certain parishioners at the Row, to consider what steps it would be proper for them to take in reference to Mr. Campbell, and that, if a petition was to be agreed upon, it would
E be proper to consult about the form beforehand: That the petition brought up by Mr. M'Lellan was produced by him, and was read in presence of Mr. M'Farlane and deponent, and Mr. Archibald Turner, who came along with Mr. M'Lellan, and brother of Peter Turner, one of the libellers,
F and probably in presence of Mr. Robert M'Farlane of Greenfield, who came in during the discussion that evening, and in presence of other members of the family, male and female: Depones, that deponent is not prepared to say that the petition was not handed to deponent: Depones, that deponent
G can neither affirm or deny that he read the petition during the discussion: Depones, that deponent read the petition, but whether that evening or next morning he cannot say: Depones, that deponent did not see Mr. M'Lellan there next morning: Depones, that the petition was left in Mr. M'Far-

lane's house that night: Depones, that deponent thinks it A
was Mr. M'Farlane who gave him the petition that evening
or next morning: Depones, that in the course of that even-
ing several alterations in the petition were agreed upon:
Depones, that the alterations were mutually agreed upon
between Mr. M'Lellan and Mr. M'Farlane, and that Mr. B
M'Farlane suggested them: Depones, that deponent does
not recollect of any alterations or suggestions being made
that night, except by Mr. M'Lellan and Mr. M'Farlane:
Depones, that next morning Mr. M'Farlane requested the de-
ponent to write over the petition with the alterations agreed C
upon—that deponent did so—that deponent did so, as he
would have done any other piece of writing, to oblige Mr.
M'Farlane: Depones, that neither on that evening, nor on
the subsequent morning, does the deponent recollect that his
opinion and advice were either asked or given on the subject, D
as the uniform principle which the deponent held, was, that
as he did not understand any sort of proceedings before
Presbyteries, he would not give any advice about it: De-
pones, that the alterations according to which deponent wrote
out the petition were verbal. That in obedience to these E
verbal suggestions, deponent wrote the memorial as it after-
wards appeared: Depones, that the memorial was Mr.
M'Lellan's petition altered. That in the memorial so pre-
pared, there was nothing but the original petition, together
with the alterations agreed upon: Depones, that Mr. M'Far- F
lane wished it to be called a memorial as agreed: Depones,
that deponent took the petition and modified it according to
the verbal instructions, writing it out in the form of the
memorial afterwards presented to the Presbytery. That
Mr. M'Farlane, junior, copied out the memorial which the G
deponent had written: Depones, that deponent's copy was
carelessly written as to penmanship: Depones, that he does
not recollect at whose suggestion the copy was taken by
young M'Farlane: Depones, that part was copied by M'Far-

A lane, junior, in deponent's presence: Depones, that it was never suggested to the deponent, that young M'Farlane's copy should be taken instead of his, in order that the deponent might be a witness: Depones, that deponent never attended any meeting of the memorialists as memorialists: B Depones, that deponent was not present at any meeting of the libellers consulting about the libel, between the date of the Presbyterial visitation and the presenting of the libel.

It was moved by the defender that this witness should only be received *cum nota*. But the Presbytery repelled C the objection, and the witness being solemnly sworn, and examined *in causâ*: Depones, that he is about 35 years of age, and unmarried: Depones, that he is a student of divinity, and that he entered the Divinity Hall about nine years ago: Depones, that he resides in the parish of Row, and has D done so since October, 1828: Depones, that he has attended the church of Row pretty regularly since that time, and it has been his ordinary place of worship, and he is a member of the church: Depones, that during that time he has frequently taken notes of Mr. Campbell's sermons: Depones, E that he was induced to take notes, partly because from the length of Mr. Campbell's sermons he found it difficult to recollect them, and partly from what he considered certain peculiarities in Mr. Campbell's doctrine: Depones, that in consequence of this he considers that he has a very distinct F recollection of these peculiarities: Depones, that the deponent has notes in his possession of sermons preached by Mr. Campbell during the twelve months libelled: Depones, that he took these notes in church at the time, in pencil, and he has since copied them for his own use, and now has them. G Depones, that the first sermon of which he has notes during that period he recollects was preached on a Sunday in the church of Row, in October, 1829.

Objection repeated as before as to Mr. Brewster and Dr. Burns, and Mr. James Browne.

Depones, that in that sermon, Mr. Campbell stated, re- A
pentance consists in this, that whereas a person that is unre-
generated does not rejoice in God, he immediately on being
regenerated does so rejoice. Many people tell us, they are
sensible how defective their outward conduct is,—they sin
daily, they say,—even their best services are exceedingly B
imperfect and unworthy, but their intentions are good.
They sincerely endeavour to abstain from sinning, and to be
holy, but the truth is, all such persons only attempt to deceive
us. Their external behaviour is cogniseable by their neigh-
bours,—they of course plead guilty of faults which they C
cannot conceal,—but their hearts being secure from the
scrutiny of others, they assert that their hearts are right.
But if they would confess the truth, they would declare
that every thought, every motion of their heart, is utterly
vile,—is only abominable rebellion against God. The gospel D
which is commonly preached in this country, which is called
gospel, but which, indeed, is not gospel, makes a man sorry
first, in order that it may make him rejoice afterward; but
the gospel which I preach makes a man rejoice as soon as he
hears it. It, therefore, is the only gospel. Nothing can be E
gospel which does not make a man rejoice as soon as he
hears it. I do not say that every one who hears me preach
rejoices immediately,—the reason is this, he will not believe
what I tell him. My meaning is, that a man on hearing me
must rejoice, provided he believe what I say." Depones, F
that what is above stated is all which the deponent took
down at the time, but from recollection of the conclusion of
Mr. Campbell's sermon, he can say that the substance of that
part of it was, "That he who will not receive the message
delivered by Mr. Campbell, viz. the doctrine that the sins of G
every individual are done away in Christ, and that God does
not impute to any one his trespasses, and that God is not
reconciled to every one present, is about to be engulphed in
the blackness of darkness in a very short time." Depones,

A that the next sermon of which the deponent took notes, was preached on the 29th of March, 1830: Depones, that the proper subject of this sermon, which was on an occasion of an ordination of elders, was to point out the nature and objects of the institution of a visible church, upon which subject
B Mr. Campbell said generally, "That the object of it was to communicate to the rest of the world the light which was in the individual members of the church, and to keep up the knowledge of God in the world. And he further stated, that the individual members were thus intended to be wit-
C nesses for God, and that no one could be a witness in this sense, unless he experienced that of which he testifies. And that he cannot declare the love of God, unless he knows from experience that God loves him. He cannot make known the riches of God's mercy, unless he has experienced
D it in the forgiveness of his own sins,—nor the extent of his beneficence, unless he knows that he has bestowed eternal life on him." Depones, that the deponent also took notes of a sermon preached by Mr. Campbell at Row on the 4th of April, 1830. That the proper subject of that sermon
E seemed to be the Millenial state, but on this occasion also Mr. Campbell introduced his doctrines on subjects both of pardon and assurance of salvation. That towards the beginning of his discourse he spoke of two classes of persons who err in religion,—"*first,* those who allege that the true
F believer endeavours as far as he can to be holy, and trusts to the merits of Christ to make up for the deficiency of his obedience. They think he has some merit in God's sight, and since God is merciful, he will on account of Christ's merits, forgive that wherein his own merits fall short. *Se-*
G *cond,* Those who admit that they have nothing whatever in themselves to recommend them to God, but that the merits of Christ are their only ground of hope,—who moreover declare that Christ's obedience is infinitely meritorious, adequate to expiate for ten thousand worlds, and many such

idle compliments they pay it,—but they will not affirm positively that Christ died for them, or made an atonement for their sins. The latter class are unbelievers equally as the former, and shall be ranked with them at the day of judgment." Depones, that toward the conclusion of his discourse Mr. Campbell again returned to these topics, and in summing up the difference between his opinions and those entertained by the generality of persons, he said, "You say you hope God will be merciful to you at the day of judgment; I maintain that that day will not be a day of mercy, but of strict justice. You say you seek an interest in Christ; I say you have an interest in Christ already, all the interest you will ever have in him. You say you hope your sins will be remitted; I say they are all already remitted." Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell preach at Row, in May, 1830. That his text was Romans viii. 17, and the subject of the sermon seemed to be the connexion between suffering and being glorified, in the case of Christ and his followers. That in his sermon, in the afternoon on that occasion, Mr. Campbell referred to the parable of the good Samaritan, and said, that in this parable, Christ meant himself by the good Samaritan; and that Christ loved every child of Adam as he loved himself, and thus he is the good Samaritan: Depones, that the deponent took notes of another sermon preached in June or July 1830, at Row. That the subject of this sermon was to exhibit the loveliness of Christ as the King that shall reign in righteousness: Depones, that in that sermon Mr. Campbell said, that "the common blessings enjoyed by man are a proof that their sins are forgiven; therefore, we err in thinking that the darkness in which the heathens live, saves them from condemnation." Depones, that the deponent has also notes of a sermon preached by Mr. Campbell, at Row, on the 4th of July, 1830: Depones, that the object of this sermon seemed to be to shew the extent of the curse consequent on the fall

of Adam, and the extent of the blessing consequent on the redemption of man by Christ: Depones, that in that sermon Mr. Campbell said that every man is in this condition, that while he has in him death in Adam, he has life given him in Christ: Depones, that Mr. Campbell also said, that the blessings of life in Christ, is co-extensive with the curse, and belongs to all upon whom the curse has passed. That in another part of the same sermon Mr. Campbell said, that we are all under a blessing as well as a curse; as Adam originated death to all, so Christ tasted death for every man: Depones, that the deponent again heard Mr. Campbell at Row, on 8th July, before the Presbytery. That on that occasion, Mr. Campbell said, in substance, that God loved, and Christ died for every human being. And the deponent was struck with Mr. Campbell using a very strong expression to that effect in the end of his discourse: Depones, that although Mr Campbell did not, in that sermon, dilate so much on this topic as the deponent had heard him on other occasions, yet the deponent understood him to maintain, in the end of his discourse, that by the death of Christ the sins of every man were taken away: Depones, that Mr. Campbell said that peacemakers are those who, like Christ, reconcile men to God: Depones, that the deponent's impression of what Mr. Campbell said, in another part of that sermon was, that the atonement of Christ, instead of applying to the elect only, applied to all men equally: Depones, that the deponent has notes of another sermon, preached by Mr. Campbell, at Row, on the 18th of July, 1830, being the Sunday before the sacrament;—that the subject of the sermon was the true scripture doctrine of self-examination—that on this occasion Mr. Campbell said, "the common doctrine on this point is, that when the scripture enjoins that a man examine himself, it requires him to do so with the object of ascertaining whether he is a believer or not. This is never enjoined in scripture;—there is but one passage in

scripture which seems to support this idea, viz. 2 Cor. xiii. A
5. It is an erroneous comment on this passage, which affords even the least ground for such an opinion. When Paul says to the Corinthians, examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves—he does not lay down a formal precept. The true scope of the passage is this—you B
seek a proof of my apostleship—rather ask, are you yourselves believers. If you are, it is through my ministry you are so. If you have faith—if Christ be formed in you, and that this is a fact, you will not at all question, then am I an apostle, for your faith is a proof of my apostleship. You C
would prove me—if so, just prove yourselves; but this is not needful, seeing you know yourselves that Christ is in you. This is the true meaning of Paul's reasoning. It is an exceedingly fundamental error to require a man who has not assurance to examine himself—it is to send me to look into D
my heart to know whether the love of God be in my heart, when the love of God cannot be there. What then is the use of self-examination? Those who have assurance may need self-examination to ascertain whether they be in a fit state for communicating. It is not true that those who have faith E
are at all times fit for sitting down at the communion table —the table may be filled with real christians, and not one worthy communicant among them all." Depones, that the deponent attended at the celebration of the sacrament, in July 1830; and that Mr. Campbell, in his sermon, previous F
to the celebration of the ordinance, taught in substance, as the deponent understood, that whoever came to communicate, not having an assurance of his own sins being taken away, and of his being a child of God, and certain of his salvation, did not come worthily, and had no right to communicate: G
Depones, that the deponent was not in a favourable situation for taking notes, and took no notes: Depones, that the deponent has frequently heard Mr. Campbell say, in substance, that there could be no such thing as faith in Christ, in any

A individual, without a persuasion or assurance in his mind that his sins were forgiven, and that he was a child of God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell frequently taught a doctrine of the following import—That if a man doubted of his own state, or disbelieved the remission of his own sins, he there-
B by made God a liar—because he said that it was stated in the scriptures that the sins of all men were forgiven, and that consequently the sins of every individual were forgiven, and that by doubting of this in his own case, any man who did so, disbelieved the testimony of God, and thereby made
C God a liar.

Interrogated for defender: Depones, that in the sermon above spoken to, as preached in the end of June, or beginning of July 1830, Mr. Campbell, in that part of the discourse which followed his statement regarding the respon-
D sibility of the heathen, added, in substance, that while the heathen are justly condemned in consequence of the light they have with respect to the forgiveness of their sins, the Gentile churches, under an infinitely clearer light, have exhibited a much greater degree of depravity than the heathen,
E and in consequence of this have subjected themselves to an infinitely greater condemnation: Depones, that in shortly defining the character spoken of in Matthew fifth, verses first to twelfth, the text of the visitation sermon, Mr. Campbell stated that the mourners are those whose attention has
F been carried off from outward things to sin. The sin of the world is the object of their sorrow. These are the mourners of Zion spoken of elsewhere in scripture. The meek correspond to the poor in spirit, with this difference, that meekness has reference to man's poverty of spirit to God: Depones,
G that the notes which deponent has employed are what he took down at the time, as partly in Mr. Campbell's words, and partly in his own, expressing what he understood to be the substance of Mr. Campbell's statements, adding that when he was not sure of the accuracy of any thing, he did

not take it down: Depones, that the reason assigned by Mr. A
Campbell for the gospel's giving joy to him that heard it, was,
that the doctrine contained in it, viz. that the sins of all men
were forgiven, was calculated to give joy to whoever believed
it, as he must believe that his sins were forgiven, and what
can be more joyful than for one to learn that his sins are B
forgiven: Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell
to use the phrase "good news" as synonymous with gospel:
Depones, that Mr. Campbell preached that a man's turning
from Satan to God is simultaneous with his joy in believing
the gospel: That the deponent understood Mr. Campbell C
to state that turning from Satan unto God was the same as
believing the fact that his sins are forgiven: Depones, that
Mr. Campbell taught that a great many more things besides
the belief of that fact arose from, or were consequent upon
the turning from Satan to God. That although the belief D
of that fact was the turning from Satan to God, yet other
things were inseparably connected with it: Depones, that
the sermon preached on the twenty-ninth of March 1830,
was preached before certain members of Presbytery appointed
by the Presbytery to assist Mr. Campbell in the ordination E
of elders.

Being interrogated whether on the fourth of April 1830,
or at any other time within the libel, deponent heard Mr.
Campbell teach that all men had the same interest in Christ
which believers had? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught F
that all men have an equal interest in Christ, and that un-
believers being men, the deponent understood him to mean
that they had an equal interest in Christ with believers.

Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that believers
had any different interest in Christ from unbelievers: De- G
pones, that he cannot say that he ever heard Mr. Campbell
explain the difference: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught
that believers had the Holy Spirit dwelling in them: De-
pones, that Mr. Campbell has not taught that unbeliev-

A ers have the Holy Spirit dwelling in them; but has taught the contrary: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has spoken of the Church as being Christ's body, and of believers as being members of that body: Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in speaking of the visible church, stated that by far the great-
B er portion of the members of the visible church were not believers: Depones, that deponent, as far as he can recollect, has never heard Mr. Campbell state that unbelievers were true members of Christ's body: Depones, that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell state, that those who die in unbe-
C lief would inherit the kingdom of heaven.

Interrogated, whether the deponent has ever heard Mr. Campbell say that God rejoiced in contemplating unbelievers: Depones, that he cannot say, absolutely, that Mr. Campbell may not have used such an expression, but he
D thinks it more probable that he did not. Interrogated if Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers were in rebellion against God? Depones, and answers, Yes. Interrogated if Mr. Campbell taught that God hated iniquity? Depones, and answers, Yes.

E Interrogated by Dr. Graham: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has taught that unbelievers were to be consigned to the blackness of darkness, and such expressions, and subjected to inconceivable punishment: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell say, that the condemnation under the gospel,
F was not that we had disobeyed the law, but that we had rejected the gospel. And on another day Mr. Campbell said, "I am asked whether unbelief is the only sin that will be punished?" to which he answered, that it was not the unbelief, but the evil heart from which the unbelief proceeded
G that was the cause of punishment: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers were those who do not believe that the sins of all are done away in Christ, and that their sins are included in this; and that the love of God embraces all men: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell say, in

substance, although he cannot speak to the particular words, A
that every one who had not assurance, was a child of the
devil and an heir of hell—meaning thereby assurance of sal-
vation.

Interrogated, whether he has heard Mr. Campbell say, that
his views upon assurance and pardon were different from B
those entertained by the Church of Scotland? Depones, that
he cannot say positively, that Mr. Campbell spoke of the
Church of Scotland; but he has heard him say, very often,
that his views were different from those which almost all
ministers taught, and almost every body believed. C

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot: Did Mr. Campbell teach
that unbelievers, understanding by that, a person who does
not believe that God loves him, or that Christ died for every
man, are, from that cause, full of enmity and rebellion against
God? Depones and answers, that they were so because of D
the natural corruption of their nature; and that although God
was reconciled to them, they were not reconciled to God.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that Mr. Campbell,
in teaching that the love of God embraces all men, did not,
as the deponent understood, teach that all men feel it as those E
do who are reconciled to him: Depones, that Mr. Campbell
taught that the guilt of those who do not feel God's love in
the way that those who are reconciled feel it, is the highest
of all guilt: Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell, in teach-
ing his doctrine of the assurance of faith, contrasted it with F
that faith which is unaccompanied with any sense of the love
of God? Depones, that he does not recollect of Mr. Camp-
bell's having so contrasted it in that way: Depones, that Mr.
Campbell contrasted his doctrine of assurance with the doc-
trine of those who had some doubts whether they should be G
made the recipients of the full amount of God's bounty, al-
though they hoped that they would be so: Depones, that
Mr. Campbell certainly represented a sense of God's good-
ness not to be a right sense, as long as the individual was ig-

A norant of God in Christ Jesus: Depones, that his impression of Mr. Campbell's teaching is, that he represents the forgiveness of sins as identical with the removal of the barrier which sin has created between God and the creature—by which the deponent means, that Mr. Campbell said that the forgive-
B ness of sins included the removal of the barrier between God and man: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell teach, moreover, that the forgiveness of sins included the resurrection of the body, and the reunion of the soul and body: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the gift of personal
C salvation to all men, is included in the forgiveness of sins, but not the possession of that gift: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the reason why, although all men had the gift of personal salvation, those who did not believe, had not the possession of it was, that they would not have it: De-
D pones, that he thinks Mr. Campbell represented the gift of personal salvation as involved in the gift of forgiveness. Interrogated what more is included in the forgiveness of sins than the removal of the barrier between God and man, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching? Depones, that the de-
E ponent considers he has already answered this question. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the belief of one's personal salvation is identical with, or included in believing the record, or is an inference from that belief? Depones, that Mr. Campbell's views, to the deponent's appre-
F hension, had some indistinctness or variation at different times: Depones, that he has frequently heard Mr. Campbell charge those who had not the assurance of their own salvation, with disbelieving the record: Depones, that he has heard him at other times say, that personal salvation ought to be inferred
G from the pardon of sins: Depones, that he has heard him at other times speak of faith and assurance, in his discourses, as if the terms were convertible: Depones, that he does not think that Mr. Campbell has ever preached that faith may be interrupted or suspended in the believer's mind; but the de-

ponent understood him to teach that there might be different degrees of faith, or that faith might be impaired: Depones, that the deponent has never heard Mr. Campbell teach that assurance might be increased; and he has never been able to catch any such idea, although he has often watched for it. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) JAMES BAIN.

PETER BAIN, teacher, Garelochhead, aged twenty-eight, unmarried, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that he has been teacher at Garelochhead for seven years—and has resided there during that time, except when attending College during winter: Depones, that he has been in the habit of attending the parish church of Row during that period, and his attendance has been regular, and he is a member of the church: Depones, that he began to take notes of Mr. Campbell's sermons in the summer of 1829, and he was induced to do so from thinking that some of Mr. Campbell's doctrines were peculiar and erroneous: Depones, that these peculiarities related to the doctrines of atonement, and pardon, and of assurance: Depones, that from the time when he began to take notes he paid particular attention to Mr. Campbell's discourses: Depones, that he was present at Row when the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered by Mr. Campbell in July 1830: Depones, that on that occasion he heard Mr. Campbell's address, after serving of the tables, to the communicants.

(Objection on the minor repeated.)

Depones, that Mr. Campbell said that the sins of all men were pardoned, and he taught that every man should believe that—and that no one was a true christian until he did so. And that every one who believed must be certain that his own sins were forgiven as well as the rest: Depones, that he said that such assurance was necessary for partaking of the

A communion—that he blamed any person for partaking of the ordinance unless he had that assurance: Depones that he recollects of Mr. Campbell holding an examination in the deponent's mother's house at Easterton, in October 1829: Depones, that he remembers Mr. Campbell's explaining the
B nature of faith on that occasion from the question in the Shorter Catechism, "What is faith in Jesus Christ?" Depones, that Mr. Campbell's explanation was that no one can have received, or be resting upon Christ for salvation, unless he had personal assurance of his own salvation: Depones, that he heard Mr.
C Campbell preach on the second of May 1830: Depones, that Mr. Campbell on that occasion taught, that the sins of the whole world were forgiven through the death of Christ; and in allusion to that, said, the faith, which you are accustomed to hear preached from this place, alone has a power
D to work godliness in the heart. All men who have not this faith, whatever their characters in other respects may be, are alike distant from the kingdom of heaven: Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell preach at Row on the fourth of July 1830, and took notes: Depones, that on that occasion
E Mr Campbell said they who admit that Christ died for all, but that there is some distance between men and the benefits resulting from his death, are commending something that is not the gospel. Men argue against the doctrine that all are redeemed and pardoned from the state of the heathen, but
F they (that is, the heathen) may infer that God loves them by observing the goodness of God displayed in his works, and they will be saved just as the Jews were saved by believing in the great sacrifice afterwards to be offered up for their sins, which was shadowed forth to them in types
G and figures. We are claiming a real glory to God when we maintain that Christ died for all: Depones, that he was present at a sermon preached by Mr. Campbell at Row on the eighteenth of July 1830, and on that occasion Mr. Campbell said, as the deponent finds from notes which he

took, "I do not know a passage where it is insinuated that A
christians stand in doubt that they are in the faith:" Depones,
that the deponent again heard Mr. Campbell preach at Row
on the eighth August 1830, and took notes. That, on that
occasion, Mr. Campbell said, by limiting God's love men
have denied that there is love in God at all. He that main- B
tains that God loves some and passes by others, denies that
there is any love in God—this would not proceed from love,
but from caprice: Depones, that the doctrine generally
taught by Mr. Campbell on the subject of the pardon of
sin, was that all men are pardoned in the same sense: De- C
pones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell preach that a min-
ister was bound, or entitled, to go to each individual and
say, your sins are forgiven: Depones, that at Mr. Campbell's
examination at Easterton, formerly deponed to, he, in exam-
ining from the Catechism, objected to the words, "Christ D
as he is offered to us in the gospel," and said that it ought
to be "given to us in the gospel," and that the use of the word
"offered," gave rise to misapprehension: Depones, that it
was usual with Mr. Campbell in his sermons to divide his
hearers into two classes, viz. those who had assurance of E
personal salvation and those who had not—and he said that
the one class were true christians, and the others were not:
Depones, that this occurred frequently: Depones, that the
deponent was informed by an uncle of his, now dead, that
in the end of September 1829, Mr. Campbell had visited F
him as a sick or dying person, and about a fortnight before
his death, and, at this visit, that Mr. Campbell said to him
that he was in hell, and that he was worse than a pagan,
because he did not see his sins pardoned.

Interrogated for the defender—in reference to the sermon G
on 1 Tim. i. 5, what was the faith which deponent was
accustomed to hear Mr. Campbell state from that place?
Depones, that it was the faith that Christ died for all, and
that their sins were pardoned, and that the Spirit was given

A in Christ to sanctify them: Depones, that deponent is sure that Mr. Campbell did not refer to the Scriptures in saying, during the examination at Easterton, that the word "given" was preferable to "offered." Being interrogated what deponent means by saying that Mr. Campbell did not refer to the B Scriptures? Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not quote any text in support of his statement: Depones, that Mr. Campbell said the word "offered" was not a Scriptural expression, and assigned that as his reason for substituting "given:" Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not commonly give any C other features of the two classes, into which he frequently divided his hearers, but that the one class had, and the other had not, an assurance of personal salvation: Depones, that deponent's uncle died in October, 1829: Depones, that in speaking of the two classes of hearers, before September, D 1830, Mr. Campbell used sometimes to talk of the fruits of faith: Depones, that he also talked of the fruits of our natural corruption and evil hearts: Depones, that deponent does not remember just now whether Mr. Campbell stated how God regarded the fruits of faith: Depones, that deponent does E not remember just now whether Mr. Campbell stated how God regarded the fruits of wicked men: Depones, that Mr. Campbell's remarks on the love of God to all men were such as appeared to deponent calculated to make men think less awfully of sin: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that sin F would be punished.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that he does not remember at present any observation of Mr. Campbell's, the tendency of which was to diminish our abhorrence of sin: Depones, that he thinks that it appeared from Mr. Campbell's G teaching, that the punishment of sin will be infinitely aggravated by the rejection of the gospel: Depones, that when the deponent's uncle mentioned to him the expressions above deponed to, he gave no explanation of them, and he seemed displeased with Mr. Campbell at having used them, and was

not very calm: Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell say, that the forgiveness of sins was equivalent to the removal of the barrier between God and man. And that he taught that howsoever great the sins of any man, the removal of that barrier opened up an access for him to God. And also that an access being thus opened, by the removal of the barrier, a man had no occasion to pray for the removal of that barrier: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the access being thus opened, a sinner, believing that it was so opened, and praying to God, might expect to receive salvation: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the belief of a sinner in the work of Christ was calculated to produce in his mind confidence of being saved: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the knowledge of the work of Christ had power to work godliness in the heart: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the design of God, in the exhibition of a crucified and risen Saviour, was to remove the iniquity of all men: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that it operated the removal of iniquity from the soul by producing a love of holiness: Depones, that when he spoke of his uncle being displeased and not very calm, he meant to express the same state of mind in these two forms of words. And all this is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) PETER BAIN.

JOHN M'FARLANE, feuar in Helensburgh, aged about 72, and married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that he was formerly an elder in the parish of Cardross, and that he now resides in Helensburgh: Depones, that he has attended the church of Row pretty regularly since Mr. Campbell came there: Depones, that he was present at the celebration of the Lord's Supper at Row, in July, 1830, and heard Mr. Campbell fence the tables: Depones, that he was struck with what Mr. Campbell said in regard to assurance of salvation:

A Depones, that about the close of Mr. Campbell's address, he said that the feast was spread for the worthy communicants, and then he added that those who had the full assurance were the worthy communicants, and that those who had not such assurance would have an awful responsibility if they B partook of the ordinance, and he left their blood on their own head: Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean personal assurance of salvation: Depones, that the deponent cannot say that what is above deponed is in Mr. Campbell's precise words, but it is the substance of C what he said: Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in his ordinary sermons, taught, and generally in his application at the close, that the death of Christ was a general death for every man.

(Objection on the minor repeated.)

Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that D by the death of Christ the sins of every individual of the human race were pardoned: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell left those who had not a personal assurance of their own salvation, in a state of condemnation: Depones, that he remembers Mr. Campbell coming to his E house in July, 1830, and on that occasion he gave the deponent's wife, who is rather frail, a copy of a sermon, which the deponent now produces, and is marked by the Moderator, and which Mr. Campbell said he had preached in the Floating Chapel at Greenock, on the twenty-eighth April: Depones, F that in consequence of what Mr. Campbell said in fencing the tables the deponent felt scruples himself about communicating, or whether he had that personal assurance which Mr. Campbell spoke of: Depones, that he officiated as an elder on that occasion, and was present when tokens were G distributed by Mr. Campbell and one Cochran, but cannot say whether he himself distributed any: Depones, that he took the sacrament on that occasion after considering with himself, and applying to himself the test mentioned by the apostle Paul, which was the deponent's standard. Interro-

gated for the defender: Depones, that the deponent is a little dull of hearing, but not very much; but rather that, which is not to be wondered at at his age. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell in fencing the tables spoke about the assurance of faith? Depones, and answers that he has told what he had to say already—that he has given what he had to say in plain language, and he can tax his memory no more about it: Depones, that what he means by the standard of the apostle Paul is what he finds in the eleventh chapter of first Corinthians, and you will also find it in the gospels: Depones, that when he says that the standard of the apostle Paul is in the eleventh chapter of first Corinthians, that the deponent refers to the twenty-eighth verse of that chapter: Depones, that deponent does not recollect and will not swear whether Mr. Campbell forbade or commanded people to examine themselves on that occasion. Being interrogated whether deponent remembers that, in spring 1830, Mr. Campbell spoke from the pulpit about people having taken him up wrong as to the meaning of the word "pardon?" Depones, that he does not: Depones, that deponent does not remember to have spoken to any one in coming home from church on a Sunday in spring 1830, regarding the meaning attached by Mr. Campbell to the word "pardon."

Interrogated by Mr. Story wherein he considered Mr. Campbell's test to differ from the apostle Paul's? Depones, that there was a difference, and that he judged for himself—and the deponent was never a great explainer of scripture, but just takes the Bible and judges for himself. Interrogated whether Mr. Campbell gave any particular instructions to his elders as to the distribution of tokens? Depones, that he never heard of a minister doing so when persons produced proper certificates, and that Mr. Campbell did not do so on this occasion, as far as the deponent understood: Depones, that he does not recollect of Mr. Campbell ever expressing to the deponent any doubt of the fitness of any particular individual to be a communicant:

A Depones, that the deponent's understanding of Mr. Campbell's doctrine about assurance did not make him hesitate about giving tokens to any particular individual, but he does not recollect whether after hearing that doctrine he gave any tokens, although he would not have refused them if they had
B been asked. And the above is truth, as he shall answer to God.

(Signed) JOHN M'FARLANE.

REV. JOHN ARTHUR, residing in Helensburgh, aged thirty-five years, and unmarried, being solemnly sworn, exa-
C mined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell preach at Row in July last on the occasion of the Presbyterial visitation: Depones, that he took no notes of the sermon: Depones, that it did not appear to him that the subject of pardon was prominently or directly
D brought forward: Depones, that he recollects Mr. Campbell using such words as these, "that the love of God to every individual of Adam's family was to be measured by the agonies of the Son of God:" Depones, that in that sermon, Jesus, as the forerunner of his people, was described as the
E great peace-maker: Depones, that he said that those men were peace-makers who were reconciled unto God: Depones, that he does not recollect Mr. Campbell saying any thing of persons knowing that Christ died for themselves, individually, or for every human being, in connexion with the character of
F peace-maker; but he recollected him saying, in substance, that we ought to imitate Christ, our head, in being peace-makers: Depones, that deponent did not on any other occasion within the year libelled hear Mr. Campbell preach. All which is truth, as he shall answer to God.

G (Signed) JOHN ARTHUR.

ALEXANDER MUNRO, now, or lately, tutor in the family of Lord John Campbell, Ardincaple-house, near Helensburgh, aged about thirty-four, and unmarried, being solemnly

sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that he is a preacher of the gospel, and has been so for about a twelvemonth: Depones, that he resided in the parish of Row from July 1829 to July 1830, after which he was absent about two or three months: Depones, that between September 1829 and the beginning of July 1830, the deponent was in the habit of attending Mr. Campbell's church about once in three Sundays or thereabouts: Depones, that it struck him that Mr. Campbell's doctrines were peculiar, and different from those of the standards of our church, in regard to the atonement, and assurance of salvation.

Objection against Mr. Brewster and Dr. Burns repeated.

Depones, that the deponent was not in the habit of taking notes: Depones, that the deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach before the Presbytery in July, 1830: Depones, that he does not remember that there was any thing in that sermon on the subject of assurance, but there was a sprinkling, in different parts of the sermon, of Mr. Campbell's peculiar views of atonement, and the pardon of sin: Depones, that it did not appear to the deponent that this formed the proper subject of the discourse: Depones, that he thinks Mr. Campbell's peculiar doctrines, in regard to pardon, were less prominently brought forward in that sermon than the deponent has heard them; but at the same time he does not think they were avoided: Depones, that on this occasion, the deponent conceives that Mr. Campbell taught that the atonement of Christ was made for all men: Depones, that towards the end of the discourse, Mr. Campbell expressed the following sentiment in substance—that the love of God to man was commensurate with the agonies of the Son of God —and that any one preaching the gospel to men, could not proclaim it to them as glad tidings, unless he could inform them that they were put by it in a certain state—by their being reconciled unto God, and their sins being pardoned—whether they knew it or not: Depones, that he does not

A remember Mr. Campbell saying that it was an indispensable feature in the character of a Christian, that he should know that God has had mercy on him, and has forgiven him: Depones, that it appeared to him that the doctrine taught by Mr. Campbell, in his sermons, generally, in regard to the atone-
B ment, was different from that of the Church, in the first place, as respects the extent of the atonement: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated that the merits of Christ's death were co-extensive with the sins of all men: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the par-
C don of sin, in consequence of the death of Christ, was not offered to all men—that it was not an offer, but a gift, put into their possession: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell, in saying this, to mean that this pardon had passed upon all men, without exception, or distinction; and
D upon the heathen who did not know it, as well as upon others: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that those who had passed from death unto life, must be assured of it; and that they could not be in a state of salvation, unless they were so assured: Depones, that he re-
E members Mr. Campbell illustrating this doctrine by observing that a soldier who passed over from the rebellious ranks, and returned to loyalty, must know the time when he did so, and could not be ignorant of his having done so.

Interrogated for the defender: Depones, that the situa-
F tion in which Mr. Campbell stated that the preacher should tell all men that they were placed, in consequence of the death of Christ, was, that God had had mercy on them, and had forgiven their sins: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to state, that the design of God in com-
G missioning his preachers to tell all men that he had had mercy on them, and had forgiven their sins, was to bring heirs to glory—to exhibit his love to his creatures, and to draw men to himself. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell stated was the condition from which God thus designed to draw

men to himself? Depones, not the state of condemnation certainly—for they were not in a state of condemnation—at least this is the inference of the witness. And the deponent cannot well say what Mr. Campbell taught on this matter: Depones, that the deponent has frequently heard Mr. Campbell speak of the state of the hearts of unbelievers towards God: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to say, that that state was, that they were not aware of the state of pardon in which they were, and of the gift put into their possession, and this ignorance prevented them from being sanctified: Depones, that deponent has certainly heard Mr. Campbell characterise them as in a state of rebellion against God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell described God as hating iniquity; but not as hating sinners: Depones, that deponent did not understand Mr. Campbell to teach that men were condemned as sinners, but as unbelievers, and that God did not hate or condemn them as sinners, but condemned them as unbelievers. Being interrogated if Mr. Campbell ever taught that God hated unbelievers? Depones, that deponent cannot remember to have heard the word "hate," applied to unbelievers; but remembers to have heard the word "condemn," so applied: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated, that unbelief proceeded from the depravity inherent in our nature, modified by all the various minor causes which may proceed from that great cause. That deponent did not perceive any thing peculiar in Mr. Campbell's mode of accounting for unbelief, except that he dwelt less upon the Spirit's influence, and more upon the operation of man's own mind, in producing the first act of belief, than the deponent considered consistent with the standards. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that any man could be believing truly in the forgiveness of his sins, and yet continuing in wickedness? Depones, that Mr. Campbell's doctrine was, that if a man truly believed that his sins were forgiven, he had eternal life in him, and would ultimately enjoy it, as he held also the

A doctrine of perseverance, which implied that: Depones, that the method by which Mr. Campbell stated that a man could come to God was, by believing the Record, which, as Mr. Campbell frequently explained it, the deponent understood to mean believing that his own sins, as well as the sins of B every other man, had been already pardoned: Depones, that when Mr. Campbell referred to the Record, deponent understood him to refer particularly to 1 John v. 11: Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to make eternal life consist in a variety of things, and his definitions seemed to C the deponent to be loose and inconsistent, and that he transposed the expression eternal life, from one set of ideas to another: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated that eternal life consisted, not merely in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, whom he had sent, but in the gift of Christ and his D dwelling in us: Depones, that another view of eternal life, given by Mr. Campbell, which the deponent considered as different from that usually given, was, that he stated that in having given to all men Christ, and as eternal life consisted in having Christ given; therefore, all men had eternal E life given them, but he did not always appear to the deponent, by the expression, eternal life, to mean everlasting happiness, but something else—but the deponent does not know precisely what; although he sometimes seemed to the deponent to make eternal happiness and holiness to F be included in his idea of eternal life. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men possessed in them Christ and the life of God? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that all men have in them the gift of Christ, understanding, as Mr. Campbell often explained it, by that the G pardon of their sins: That the deponent does not precisely know what may be meant in this question by the expression "the life of God," which he thinks may have various meanings: But deponent adds that he did not understand Mr. Campbell to teach the Arminian doctrine that all men had a

portion of grace given them to improve, if that sense be at- A
tached to the phrase "the life of God:" Depones, that de-
ponent does not remember Mr. Campbell to have taught that
all men have Christ dwelling in them by the Holy Ghost.
Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that any
man could be alive unto God except by the indwelling of the B
Holy Ghost? Depones, that understanding the phrase "alive
to God" to mean "the state into which a man passes when
by the knowledge of the gospel, blessed by the influence of
the Holy Spirit, he becomes justified in the sight of God,"
that he does not conceive that Mr. Campbell taught that in C
this sense a man could be "alive to God," except by the in-
fluence of the Holy Spirit; but, as the deponent formerly
said, Mr. Campbell did not seem to insist much on the ne-
cessity of the Spirit's influence in producing the first act of
belief, but rather that the influence of the Spirit was a conse- D
quent of the first act of belief—although deponent does not
deny that Mr. Campbell may have taught that the Spirit's in-
fluence operated to produce the first act of belief: Depones,
that Mr. Campbell seemed to hold that men were active in un-
belief, but rather passive in belief: Depones, that deponent E
never heard Mr. Campbell state that a man could know the
gospel without being blessed by the influences of the Spirit:
Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated that if a man knew the
gospel, the influences of the Spirit must flow into his mind—
understanding by the gospel the pardon of his sins: Depones, F
that deponent understood Mr. Campbell's view of the matter,
in saying that a believer was rather passive than active in be-
lieving, to be that unbelievers resisted and put away from them
the gospel, and that if they would only cease their resistance
the gospel would flow into them. Being interrogated whether G
Mr. Campbell taught that those who had passed from death to
life could never, for any time, however short, cease to be as-
sured of their personal salvation? Depones, that the deponent
has heard Mr. Campbell admit that there might be times when,

A through the temptations of Satan, obscurity might rest on the believer's mind—but still there was always something which kept up the idea of assurance of his state—though the deponent confesses that it was always inexplaining that something, that Mr. Campbell seemed to the deponent to find the great-
B est difficulty, and which was never intelligible to the deponent.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the knowledge of the gospel commenced a sanctifying process in the mind of the believer—and the deponent also understood Mr. Camp-
C bell to teach that this sanctifying process terminated in perfect holiness only in the next world: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that God was dissatisfied with the acts and state of a sinner, but not at enmity with the sinner himself: Depones, that Mr. Camp-
D bell in applying the word redemption to all men, and to each man, sometimes made it synonymous with atonement, or satisfaction, as applied to all men, and sometimes in the particular sense of the final salvation of an individual sinner: Depones, that Mr. Campbell, in varying the ordinary forms
E of speech, seemed to be anxious to do away with the delusions of people in supposing that they had something to do in order to propitiate the love of God, and that he dwelt much upon this; but the deponent adds that Mr. Campbell seemed to him on one or two occasions, to teach that the
F sufferings and toils of saints were necessary to follow on the death of Christ, seeming, as it were, to imply that they were necessary to complete the atonement of Christ—but in general he was not struck with any thing peculiar in Mr. Campbell's doctrine regarding the sufferings of saints: Depones,
G that in saying he conceived that Mr. Campbell's views on the subject of assurance of salvation were different from the views stated in the standards of our church, he alluded to the eighteenth chapter of the Confession of Faith, and he thought Mr. Campbell's doctrine to be inconsistent with

the third section of that chapter: Depones, that the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teach that when a believer was under the influence of the temptations of Satan an obscurity might come over his mind, but still there was a something formerly alluded to by the deponent, of the nature of assurance, which remained. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) ALEX. MUNRO.

The following witnesses were then examined for the defender, viz.

MR. HERVEY STRONG, sometime residing in Glasgow, now in Helensburgh, aged about thirty-eight, and married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that deponent resided in Helensburgh between August, 1829, and October, 1830, and attended the parish church very regularly: Depones, that the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell preach also in the school-house at Helensburgh, and in the manse.

Depones, that in September or October, 1829, deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach in the school-house of Helensburgh on the text "Is there no balm in Gilead?" Depones, that Mr. Campbell on that occasion brought out his doctrine on the subject of atonement and pardon, which deponent always held to be one and the same; but the deponent has no distinct recollection of the words used by Mr. Campbell, or whether he preached on that occasion on the doctrine of assurance: Depones, that the object of Mr. Campbell's discourse was to illustrate the freeness of the gospel, and the fulness of the atonement: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught at that time, as at all times, that the atonement was literally for every man, and that Christ died for every man: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated that there were two classes of human beings, the one in enmity and distrust towards God, the other in confidence and love towards him; which statements

A accorded with Mr. Campbell's general teaching: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that every man was by nature in a state of enmity to God, and that he required to be brought out of that state in order to be in a state of salvation: Depones, that Mr. Campbell stated that the love of God in
B Christ, manifested on the cross, was that which, when apprehended by any man as applicable to himself, brought him, by appropriating Christ to himself, out of the one state into the other—that then his enmity and distrust ceased, and his confidence and love commenced: Depones, that Mr. Camp-
C bell stated that the love of God manifested in the cross, as a love to the individual, was the light through which he could see sin, and that light alone; that it was a light by which he could perceive the abominable nature of sin;—that God's love in the heart, which can only come there by an appropriating
D act of faith, is light and life—it is the Spirit of Christ in him. He sees sin then as Christ saw it; that no man can have any correct notion of sin at all, or see sin in its true character, unless by the light of the gospel: Depones, that deponent did not understand Mr. Campbell to teach that night that a be-
E lief that one's sins are pardoned was the only feature of a christian character: But Mr. Campbell held that a man's belief that his own sins are forgiven is essential to his being a christian, and that he has no life till he has that in his heart.

Depones, that, although deponent does not recollect that
F Mr. Campbell did so on that night, he knows that Mr. Campbell always held forth that mere seriousness is nothing, that seriousness is no excuse for being in error: Depones, that when Mr. Campbell so used the word seriousness, he understood him to refer to a seriousness which might consist with
G a misapprehension of God's character—that a man might be serious with the idea that he was under the law of works, and might desire to do good works, but that that was no apology, but, on the contrary, it was his condemnation that he had not the light: That Mr. Campbell never undervalued

seriousness in the right apprehension of the truth: That Mr. A
Campbell illustrated his position by reference to the earnest-
ness with which heathens may worship; that a heathen may
be as serious in the wrong apprehension of God as if he had
had the right apprehension of God: Depones, that deponent
is perfectly sure that if he had heard Mr. Campbell condemn- B
ing any seriousness but such as above described he would
have noticed it.

Depones, that on the night above alluded to deponent did
not hear Mr. Campbell speak of unbelief as the only cause
of sorrow, and is confident that had he heard it he would C
have marked it: Deponent has always heard Mr. Campbell
teach that sin was the only cause of sorrow in believers, and
that unbelievers could have no right sorrow for sin—that they
might have an imitation of sorrow for sin, because they might
come into punishment, but that was no right sorrow for sin, D
and it was a sin to be in a state to have that sorrow merely;
that the right sorrow was a sorrow for sin as sinning against
love, and as seeing sin as a hateful thing in itself, offensive to
God, and offensive to that spirit which is in a christian; that
a christian had the mind of Christ, and looked upon sin with E
that kind of sorrow which Christ had: That deponent never
understood Mr. Campbell to state thereby that Christ had
sorrow for his own sin, for he never heard Mr. Campbell state
that Christ had sin—on the contrary he always held that Christ
was without sin; that the sorrow which believers had for sin F
was a sorrow for all sin, in themselves, and in every other
creature.

Depones, that he has often heard Mr. Campbell teach and
preach concerning an interest in Christ—meaning that every
man has an interest in Christ; that Christ was the gift of G
God to the world; that the sense in which Mr. Campbell
said that every man had an interest in Christ was this, that
every man had a right to take—to possess—to appropriate
him, and it was every man's sin to whom the gospel was

A preached that he did not: Depones, that when Mr. Campbell spoke of taking, or appropriating Christ, and of believing the record which God has given of his Son, deponent understood him to mean the same thing—that a man apprehending the gospel rightly does receive and appropriate Christ as his Sa-
B viour: Depones, that God has made a provision of strength for every man to live in the truth of the gospel: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the Holy Ghost took of the things of the gospel and shewed them to the man's soul; and that this strength was to be had in answer to prayer.

C Depones, that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell teach that a man could be a true believer merely by believing that his sins were forgiven, unless he saw how they were forgiven—that there was no power to sanctify in the mere belief that one's sins were forgiven, unless more than that was
D seen. Being interrogated, whether if, on the evening above alluded to, Mr. Campbell had stated that a sense of guilt and unworthiness had no connexion with believing, it would have struck deponent? Depones and answers, certainly, he could not have stated it without the deponent's noticing it—
E because it would have been perfectly contrary to what Mr. Campbell has always taught on that subject, viz. that a man cannot have that sense unless he is a believer: Depones, that, although deponent does not remember whether Mr. Campbell spoke, that night, of an anxiety about salvation without a
F true sense of sin, yet deponent has heard Mr. Campbell on the subject, say, that a man's anxiety may imply unbelief.

Being interrogated whether the view given by Mr. Campbell that night of the love of God, appeared to deponent to have a tendency to make men easy about sin? Depones and
G answers, that he never heard Mr. Campbell, on that night, or on any occasion within the time libelled, preach any doctrine which had a tendency to licentiousness—unless the free grace—the free love, and the free forgiveness of God have that tendency.

Depones, that he did not, on that night, hear Mr. Camp- A
bell preach that the cause of the whole of man's misery was
their allowing themselves to remain in doubt regarding the
simple fact of their having been individually restored to a
state of favour with God—and that he thinks he should have
noticed it, had Mr. Campbell so preached, because it was B
not like a statement of Mr. Campbell's at all.

Depones, that deponent heard nothing in the sermon above
deponed to, in the school-house at Helensburgh, which at
the time appeared to deponent to militate against the Scrip-
tures, which state that men shall be judged for the deeds C
done in the body: Depones, that Mr. Campbell has, during
the year libelled, always represented the ground of condem-
nation at the last day to be unbelief, or the rejection of
Christ—that unbelief, or the rejection of Christ, proceeded
from the evil heart of man—that that evil heart made man D
unwilling to come to Christ—that the evil heart was to be
referred to the fall of man in Adam—that the wicked deeds
of men were to be referred to their love of evil: Depones,
that Mr. Campbell did not represent unbelief as the only sin
under the gospel dispensation: Depones, that Mr. Campbell E
associated judgment for the deeds done in the body with
condemnation for unbelief, by stating that God's judgment
would be according to righteousness, and that a man must
be righteous, or have the Spirit of Christ, otherwise he would
be condemned—that Mr. Campbell said, that having God's F
love in the heart, was the having the Spirit of Christ: De-
pones, that Mr. Campbell was in the habit of teaching the
connexion between being righteous and having the mind of
Christ—and illustrated that connexion by stating that one
that had the mind of Christ was one who apprehended the G
love of God in Christ to him; and that the love of God in
the heart was holiness, or having the Spirit of Christ. Inter-
rogated—to what power Mr. Campbell referred the righteous
deeds of believers? Depones and answers, the love of God

A in the heart was the operating power: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the love of God was sustained in the heart of man by the strength of the Holy Ghost: Depones, that Mr. Campbell, on the evening deponed to, pressed the acceptance of the gospel upon his hearers: Depones, that
B Mr. Campbell, on that evening, as always, represented God as a sin-avenging God.

Depones, that Mr. Campbell constantly, during the year libelled, gave a view of God's justice in punishing unbelievers at the last day—and adds, it is a prominent feature of his
C discourses, exhibiting to his hearers the wrath of God towards those who reject Christ—and is a common expression with him "Knowing the terrors of the Lord we persuade men:" Depones, that the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell, during the time libelled, treat of the redemption of all men
D by Christ: Depones, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell thereby to mean, redeemed from the curse—taken from under the law, or the law of works, and placed under grace: Depones, that deponent understood that it did not include deliverance from the judgment to come.

E Depones, that deponent was a communicant at the sacrament, in July, 1830: Depones, was at the second or third table—a table which Mr. Campbell addressed—and heard Mr. Campbell fence the tables on that day: Depones, that both in the previous discourse, and in the fencing of the
F tables, Mr. Campbell treated of the way in which believers might eat and drink damnation or judgment to themselves—that deponent understood this to mean, much as Mr. Campbell explained it, and very nearly in his own words—that a believer might eat and drink damnation to himself by not
G abiding in the faith at the time; and if he did not discern the Lord's body: Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell thereby to refer to temporal judgment—that Mr. Campbell stated, that a Christian was not abiding in the faith at the time, or discerning the Lord's body, if he did not dis-

cern, and realize at the time, that the body was broken and A
the blood shed for him; of which things the bread and wine
were symbols. Being interrogated, whether on occasion of
so fencing the tables, deponent heard Mr. Campbell debar
from the Lord's Supper all who had not a personal assurance
of their own salvation? Depones, and answers—nothing of B
the kind—I heard no debarring but what was implied in the
above explanation of eating and drinking judgment—that
they were in that *warned:* Depones, that Mr. Campbell
forbade nobody, and deponent watched narrowly, for he had
heard that Mr. Campbell had been accused of doing so on C
former sacramental occasions.

Depones, that deponent has often heard Mr. Campbell, in
his public prayers, praying for the pardon of sins—and never
heard him pray without it.

Depones, that he has heard Mr. Campbell teach and D
preach concerning the doctrine of assurance. That he
divided assurance into assurance of faith and assurance of
sense—and did so frequently: Depones, that he defined
assurance of faith to be, that a man who had a right appre-
hension of the gospel was, while abiding in that right appre- E
hension, conscious of his own salvation as being a child of
God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell defined the assurance of
sense to be, the consequence of a right faith—the Spirit's
witnessing with his spirit, that he was a child of God:
Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of F
faith above defined was capable of interruption, for it was
always guarded with the "while abiding in the faith:"
Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the absence of that
assurance was sinful in every man: Depones, that Mr.
Campbell taught that whoever had not the assurance of faith G
was not believing the record of God, or had not that record
in his mind at the time: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught
that if a man was without the consciousness of the Bible
at the time on his mind, it was to him as being without

A the Bible, as he was not under the influence of it at the time.

Depones, that deponent was present at Mr. Campbell's visitation sermon in July 1830, of which the leading subject was the beatitudes: Depones, that Mr. Campbell then
B preached that a believer was in the partial enjoyment of the beatitudes in this life, and would have the full enjoyment of them in the future life: Depones, that deponent observed no difference between Mr. Campbell's sermon on that occasion and his ordinary sermons about that time in point of
C doctrine.

Interrogated for the libellers: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the pardon of sins through the death of Christ was universal, and extended to the sins of all men, and the pardon was for all men—by which Mr. Campbell
D meant, as the deponent understood, that the sins of every man were judicially removed, so that it was no reason why a man should not, and might not, come to God, and that unless the sins of the world had been so put away, God could not, consistently with his holiness, invite or command
E any man to come to him—that every man, in consequence of the death of Christ, not only had a right to come, but his not coming was his highest condemnation: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the sins of every individual of the human race were, in point of fact, forgiven, in the sense
F above explained, and not merely that they would be forgiven if they came to Christ: and that Mr. Campbell never taught in that form that their sins would be forgiven, but that they were forgiven: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a man cannot believe savingly unless he sees that his own in-
G dividual sins are forgiven.

Depones, that deponent conceives that Mr. Campbell, in praying for the pardon of sin, did not pray for forgiveness as the reversal of the sentence of eternal wrath—but deliverance from temporal chastisements or judgments: Depones,

that he considered that Mr. Campbell, in so praying for de- A
liverance from temporal chastisements, or judgments, prayed
for the pardon of sin: Depones, that it seems to the depon-
ent that the parable in the gospel of Matthew of a certain king
who forgave a servant ten thousand talents, and afterwards
delivered him over to the tormentors—that that servant re- B
presents man and the relation in which man stands to God
in the day of grace—that that servant after having been
forgiven might rightly have prayed for forgiveness for any
departure from righteous conduct—that in praying he was
acknowledging, or putting to his seal, that it would be a C
righteous thing to deliver him over to the tormentors, if he
was not found, on the day of reckoning, to have been acting
in the Spirit, towards his fellow men, in which he had been
dealt with by his King, and his prayer might have been, "forgive
me, or acquit me, as I have been found dealing with others." D

Depones, that when Mr. Campbell stated that in conse-
quence of the death of Christ all sins were forgiven, the
deponent understood him to teach that all sins without ex-
ception, unbelief as well as others, were forgiven in conse-
quence of the death of Christ, and that this was the procla- E
mation of the gospel, and that there was no farther atone-
ment for sin: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that
every man, whether he has heard of the gospel or not, is ex-
posed to the wrath of God, but not to the curse of the law
in consequence of sin either original or actual: Depones, F
that the deponent considers the difference between being
exposed to the wrath of God and exposed to the curse of
the law, to be, that the state of the soul of the unbeliever
towards God is that of being under the law of works—that
all men are taken from under the law—but believers keep G
themselves in that state—that the deponent is not sure
whether this observation is his own idea or derived from
Mr. Campbell's teaching: Depones, that the deponent sees
no inconsistency between his answers to the two last ques-

A tions: Depones, that the sins of a man who has never heard of the gospel are as much atoned for as the sins of a man who has heard of it, and believed: and that a man's sins are not atoned for because he believes: Depones, that Mr. Campbell in praying, as above deponed to, for the pardon
B of sin, always prayed for deliverance from temporal chastisements or judgments, as being the forgiveness of sins, and not for a reversal of the sentence of eternal wrath—and the deponent cannot understand that any christian can pray for forgiveness as the reversal of the sentence of eternal wrath—
C because our Lord and Saviour told his beloved disciples, who were pardoned persons, and who knew that they were delivered from the sentence of eternal wrath, and could not fall under eternal condemnation, to pray for forgiveness, and that *they* could not pray for forgiveness as the reversal of
D eternal wrath, for they knew they were delivered from the possibility of coming under it—they had eternal life, which they could never lose—and this last is the deponent's own idea—although he will not say that he may not have come to it by Mr. Campbell's teaching: Depones, that the de-
E ponent in speaking of a man being conscious of his own salvation, meant that he had no doubt of it, and was certain of it. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that a man could not be a christian if he doubted of his own salvation? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught
F that a christian might fall into such darkness as to doubt whether the Bible was the word of God—and still be a Christian while he so doubted, because once a Christian, always a Christian, and he cannot fall off—but in this state he is not exhibiting the character of a Christian.

G Reinterrogated for the defender: Depones, that Mr. Campbell never taught that there were any men whom the gospel did not concern: Depones, that in regard to the heathen, Mr. Campbell taught that every thing they enjoyed —the light of the sun, and the rain from heaven, was an

expression of God's goodness and love towards them— A
and that it was owing to the death of Christ that these
benefits flowed to them: Depones, that the confession of
sin, and prayer for deliverance from evil, constituted a pro-
minent feature of Mr. Campbell's public prayers: Depones,
that deponent never understood Mr. Campbell to state, or to B
imply, that it would be a right thing in a believer, to suppose
himself an heir of eternal wrath: Depones, that Mr. Camp-
bell taught that a believer must believe himself possessed of
an inheritance, and that he had the earnest of the inheritance
of the saints: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a C
believer could not, at the time, be exhibiting the character
of a believer, if he did not believe that he had the inheritance
of the saints.

Interrogated by Mr. Carr: Depones, that the way in
which Mr. Campbell expressed himself in making confession D
of sins in his public prayers, was by saying, that we were
justly deserving of condemnation, and unworthy of the least
of God's mercies—and this was one of many forms of con-
fession: Depones, that deploring sin, and confessing sin,
and imploring deliverance from sin, formed the burden of E
Mr. Campbell's public prayers.

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot: Depones, that the depo-
nent understood Mr. Campbell, in saying, that men would be
condemned for unbelief, to mean, that they would be con-
demned for rejecting Christ, and for denying the position F
that Christ died for their sins, and that in rejecting Christ,
any one was trampling under foot the Son of God, and
counting the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and not
sufficient for his salvation—that his remaining, or being found
in a state of unrighteousness, was the consequence of his re- G
jecting Christ—Christ was a provision of deliverance from
an unholy state.

Being interrogated whether when Mr. Campbell said that
a believer in communicating unworthily, ate and drank dam-

A nation to himself, deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean, that faith was destroyed in principle, or merely suspended in its actings: Depones, it was suspended in action: Depones, that in the visitation sermon, Mr. Campbell stated, in substance, that the measure of the love of God to every B individual was expressed in the agonies of Christ, and that was what he always preached.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that God is pleading with every human being to turn to him and live. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach C regarding the desire of God, that men should pray to him? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that it is the desire of God that men should pray to him, and that they are commanded to seek the Spirit: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that a man cannot pray acceptably to God, while D totally ignorant of God. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding the forgiveness of sins or the atonement, as expressive of this desire in the mind of God, that all men should pray to him? Depones, that they should seek deliverance from sin. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught, E or did not teach, that every prayer proceeding from a believer, of necessity implies the knowledge of its being well pleasing to God? Depones, and answers, certainly—that the life of a Christian is prayer. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding the connexion of prayer with the F enjoyment of this life? Depones and answers—that prayer is communion with God, and life to the soul. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding the solemn mockery of a believer praying, that he may have liberty of access to him? Depones and answers—that Mr. Campbell taught that G a real believer cannot pray for liberty of access, because he cannot be a real believer if he prays for liberty of access to God. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding the origin of all temporal sufferings? Depones and answers—that the origin is man's departure from God. Inter-

rogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach is the end or object A
of these sufferings? Depones and answers—to bring men
back to God: Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not teach
that believing the gospel delivers men from temporal suffer-
ings: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that the temporal
chastisements of believers teach them that they are sinners. B
Interrogated, did Mr. Campbell teach that a believer has any
reason to expect that God his Father, will remove from him
those chastisements inflicted on account of his sins, unless he
confess those sins in the knowledge of God being just to
forgive him his sins? Depones and answers—no, he must be C
in the knowledge that God is just to forgive him his sins.
Interrogated, did Mr. Campbell teach what the believer,
knowing that God is just to forgive him his sins, and to
cleanse him from all unrighteousness, is to do? Depones
and answers—to seek in prayer to be delivered and cleansed. D
Interrogated, how it is that the deponent said formerly that
unbelief is forgiven as well as other sins? Depones and
answers—that all sins are atoned for, and there is no more
atonement, and if that sin is not atoned for, no man can be
saved, because every man has been an unbeliever—and the E
deponent understands that to have been Mr. Campbell's
teaching. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that
the assurance of faith and the assurance of sense, were
always co-existing? Depones and answers—that he cannot
say that he taught that, but the deponent would infer that F
—that he never heard him explain it particularly in that
form. Interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the
second assurance alluded to, originated from the first? De-
pones and answers, certainly.

Interrogated by Dr. Hamilton: Did Mr. Campbell teach G
that the assurance of salvation was simultaneous with the
assurance of faith? Depones and answers—that he taught
that the assurance of faith precedes the assurance of sense,
and consequently cannot be simultaneous with it. Interro-

A gated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of salvation is inseparable from the assurance of faith? Depones and answers—that Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of salvation certainly is inseparable from the assurance of faith. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding
B the manner in which a Christian may arrive at the assurance of his own salvation? Depones and answers—that a Christian is conscious of life, and thereby knows that his faith is right. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach regarding the evidences of grace, and as to whether self-examina-
C tion was necessary by a Christian to ascertain his own state of salvation? Depones and answers—that he is conscious of it, and therefore knows it without examination. Interrogated, whether did Mr. Campbell teach that it was a right or a wrong thing for a man to examine himself, in order to
D ascertain whether he was in a state of salvation? Depones and answers—that Mr. Campbell taught that it was a right thing for a Christian to examine himself, and to be watchful over himself, but not in order to ascertain his being in a state of salvation, because a man could not be alive and not know
E it. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) HERVEY STRONG.

JAMES WHITSHED HAWKINS, Esq. Advocate, residing in No. 21, Charlotte square, St. George's parish, Edinburgh,
F aged 35, and married, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice, and partial counsel: Depones, that the deponent knows the defender, and has frequently heard him preach, and otherwise express his religious doctrines, within the time libelled: Depones, that deponent first heard a pri-
G vate exposition by Mr. Campbell in Edinburgh, in December, 1829, or January, 1830, and heard Mr. Campbell preach, for the first time, on an occasional visit to Helensburgh, in the end of May, or beginning of June, 1830: Depones, that deponent and his family came to Helensburgh about the 5th

July, 1830, and remained till after the communion Sabbath. A
That during that time Mr. Campbell besides preaching twice
on the Sabbath, either in his own parish or in the neighbour-
hood, expounded on Wednesday, or Wednesday evenings,
and preached on Thursday forenoons, in his own parish:
Depones, that deponent is not aware of having missed any B
sermon or exposition during that time, except on one occa-
sion, when he did not hear the whole of an exposition.

Depones, that deponent felt perfectly satisfied, from attend-
ing Mr. Campbell's teaching on the occasions above men-
tioned, that Mr. Campbell taught that the death of Christ, as C
a sacrifice, was for all men, without distinction: Depones,
that deponent always understood from Mr. Campbell's teach-
ing, that the death of Christ was a manifestation of the love
of God to all men: Depones, that this manifestation of the
love of God to all men, certainly did not appear, from Mr. D
Campbell's teaching, to indicate any toleration of iniquity in
the mind of God;—meaning by toleration not *forbearance*,
but *countenance*, *indifference*, or *approbation*: Depones, that
Mr. Campbell was in the habit of teaching, that men were to
find the greatest manifestation of God's hatred against sin in E
the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ. Being interrogated,
what Mr. Campbell taught to have been the intention of
God in giving his Son? Depones and answers—I always
understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that God gave his Son
to die, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto F
God,—meaning by the word "us" all mankind—speaking
of the moral and honest intention displayed in the work,
without any reference to secret purposes. Being interro-
gated, what deponent understands when he speaks of secret
purposes, in reference to Mr. Campbell's teaching? Depones G
and answers, I always understood Mr. Campbell perfectly to
recognise the election of God the Father. Being interro-
gated, whether Mr. Campbell spoke of that election as an
eternal purpose, or as a purpose originated in time? Depones

A and answers—as an eternal purpose. Being interrogated, what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach regarding the relation between the election of God the Father, and the coming of any man to him in Christ? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Campbell to teach that God had a desire B and will that all men should be saved—that as a manifestation of that desire, he had opened up a way of access to himself, by which he desired all to come to him—that God had also removed the barrier—the barrier which the holiness of God interposed to the access of the sinner to God—and C that, not by laying aside his holiness, but by a work which enabled him, consistently with his holiness, to receive the vilest sinner who came to him through the access which he had himself opened up. Being interrogated, whether any but the elect of God the Father could thus come to God D through Christ? Depones and answers, I always understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that, in point of fact, none but the elect would ever come to God; but that the condemnation was that men would not come to him, notwithstanding of what he had done for them to induce them to come.

E Depones, that the deponent has frequently heard Mr. Campbell use the words forgiveness and pardon in his preaching, which deponent supposes were used as synonymous. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men were forgiven or pardoned? Depones and answers, I have heard Mr. F Campbell teach that the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ hath procured forgiveness for all men—that this doctrine was not always the prominent subject of his teaching, but that when he treated it, he so expressed himself. Being interrogated whether or not Mr. Campbell taught that this forgive- G ness or pardon of all men, was a deliverance from judgment to come? Depones and answers, certainly not. Being interrogated what then Mr. Campbell taught that it was? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that, during the day of grace, it was a non-imputation of trespasses—the

sacrifice of Christ putting the sinner in the condition, and giv- A
ing him the privilege of coming to God as his reconciled Father
in Jesus Christ. Being interrogated to what power, work,
or operation, Mr. Campbell referred a man's coming to God
in Christ? Depones and answers, to the work of the Holy
Spirit in bringing home the testimony of God in the gospel B
to the heart of the sinner. Being interrogated whether Mr.
Campbell taught that any man ever received that testimony
but by the Holy Ghost? Depones and answers, I understood
him to teach, that while, in point of fact, no one ever did re-
ceive that testimony otherwise than by the Holy Ghost, there C
was no physical impossibility in a man's believing *any one* tes-
timony, who could believe *another* testimony; and that the
condemnation of men was, that they *received the witness of*
men, and *rejected that of God*, which is greater.

Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teaching D
concerning the ground on which the judgment to come would
proceed. Being interrogated by whom Mr. Campbell stated
that that judgment would be executed? Depones and an-
swers, by the Son of God; who having, as our brother, ful-
filled the law of God, and purchased us with his blood, has E
a right to reign over us, and to judge us. Being interrogated,
what Mr. Campbell taught would be the ground or prin-
ciple of that judgment? Depones and answers, it is as those
to whom God has shewn mercy, that we shall be judged.
Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that men F
would, or would not be judged according to their deeds, by
Christ? Depones and answers, he taught that men shall cer-
tainly be judged by their works—but according to the gos-
pel, and not according to the law. Being interrogated whe-
ther Mr. Campbell taught that the sin of unbelief was the G
only sin which would be judged? Depones and answers, he
taught that the actual condition of men, in the day of judg-
ment, would be the result of their believing or not believing
the gospel. That those, therefore, who will be condemned,

A will be condemned for unbelief. Being interrogated, whether, when Mr. Campbell taught that all sins were forgiven through the sacrifice of Christ, deponent understood him to include the sin of unbelief? Depones and answers, that unbelief, during the day of grace—that is, every repeated act of unbelief
B was forgiven, as well as any other sin ;—but that the condition of the sinner, at the expiry of the day of grace, if not found prepared for God's judgment in righteousness, would expose him to that wrath of God which is revealed against all unrighteousness of men—and this for the reason that the ma-
C nifestation of God's forgiving love, during the day of grace, was never contemplated by God to place the sinner out of his judgment, but to prepare him for it.

Being interrogated whether deponent understood, or did not understand, that the view given by Mr. Campbell, in his
D teaching, of the love of God, was one calculated to make men easy in sin? Depones and answers, never. And he taught, that the reason why a man will not believe the love of God is, that he would keep his sin. Being interrogated whether or not Mr Campbell taught that a knowledge of the charac-
E ter of God was essential to a belief in the forgiveness of sins? Depones and answers, most undoubtedly he did so teach, and that no man would believe in the forgiveness of his sins who did not see the righteousness of God in the forgiveness of his sins—and consequently that no one could receive the re-
F mission of sins, except by believing in Jesus Christ.

Being interrogated, whether deponent has heard Mr. Campbell teach concerning seriousness, anxiety, and a sense of sin? Depones and answers, that in reference particularly to this question, deponent would state, that from having not only
G heard Mr. Campbell preach and teach on the above occasions —but having read printed notes of his sermons, deponent cannot positively say, whether his understanding as to Mr. Campbell's teaching on the subject of this question, is derived from having heard Mr. Campbell, or from having read these

notes—but that deponent's impression of what he conceived A
Mr. Campbell to have taught on the subject is as vivid as
if he had heard him yesterday: but that did this obser-
vation, as to the above printed notes, apply to the deponent's
previous testimony, his whole evidence would require to be
taken *cum nota*—the observation, therefore, is not to be ap- B
plied to the rest of the evidence: Depones, that deponent's
impression, as to what Mr. Campbell taught on that subject,
when deponent heard him within the time libelled, is, that he
taught that there was no holiness in anxiety—inasmuch, as
it proceeded, in most cases, from selfish feelings, and had no C
connexion with the glory of God. Being interrogated, whe-
ther Mr. Campbell taught that an unbeliever could or could
not have a sense of sin? Depones and answers, that deponent
never understood Mr. Campbell to affirm that an unbeliever
was necessarily ignorant that he was a sinner—nay, he might D
feel that he was a great sinner—but that it was only through
the belief of the gospel, and the receiving of God's views
concerning sin, that men were taught to make a right estimate
of it.

Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding E
believers, in reference to the duty of self-examination and
watchfulness? Depones, that he heard Mr. Campbell state,
as deponent thinks, on the Sabbath preceding the communion
at Row, in 1830, that a believer's self-examination was not
with a view of ascertaining whether he was a believer or not F
—but for matter of humiliation and watchfulness for the
future—and, in particular, in the prospect of the communion.
Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught, and if he
did, what he taught concerning self-examination and watch-
fulness in unbelievers: Depones, that he never understood G
Mr. Campbell to address any precepts to unbelievers, but to
call upon them to believe the gospel. That Mr. Campbell
always taught that that which is born of the flesh is flesh,
and therefore he could not address, to unbelievers, com-

A mands which they could not obey without the Spirit. Being interrogated whether deponent understood thereby, that unbelievers were not *responsible* to God for obedience to all his commands? Depones and answers—I always understood him to teach that all men, unbelievers as well as believers, B are all personally bound to glorify God—but not in the flesh —that is the natural state, which Mr. Campbell referred to the fall of man in Adam.

Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught concerning the relation between the Holy Spirit and all men? Depones C and answers—that he taught that Christ was the gift of God to all men, and that *in Christ* were contained all things pertaining to life and godliness, and that *in Christ* they had the Holy Ghost: Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not teach that unbelievers were *in* Christ—but that all men were in- D cluded *under* Christ as a righteous head, through whom the forgiveness of sins flowed to all men: Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not teach that unbelievers had the Holy Spirit *in them.*

Being interrogated whether deponent has heard Mr. Camp- E bell in his teaching, apply the word redemption to the work of Christ? Depones, that he taught that all men were redeemed from the curse of the law by Christ—but certainly not from judgment to come, nor from subjection to the law as a rule of life—the work of Christ being for the very pur- F pose, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us—not in the flesh, but in the spirit.

Being interrogated whether deponent remembers to have heard Mr. Campbell apply the words redemption and redeemed, to believers in particular? Depones and answers— G that deponent cannot recall any particular occasion on which he did so, but has heard Mr. Campbell apply the words "redeemed from all iniquity, and purified as a peculiar people, zealous of good works," to the elect people of God.

Being interrogated whether deponent has heard Mr.

Campbell teach on the subject of assurance? Depones and A
answers—I have never heard Mr. Campbell preach a sermon
on the subject of assurance, particularly; but I always un-
derstood him to preach that to believe God's love, and to be
assured of it, is the same thing, and that no man is believing
it who is not assured of it as applicable to himself—but B
deponent has never understood Mr. Campbell to say, that a
regenerate person may never lose the assurance of God's
love to himself—but that in so doing, he is then not believ-
ing God's testimony.

Depones, that deponent was present at the visitation ser- C
mon which Mr. Campbell preached in July, 1830, before the
Presbytery: Depones, that in that sermon Mr. Campbell,
deponent thinks, said, in substance, that believers were the
small number, or something to that effect. That the text
was Matthew v. verses 1 to 12. Being interrogated whe- D
ther Mr. Campbell in that sermon treated the tenth, eleventh,
and twelfth verses? Depones and answers, I remember dis-
tinctly that Mr. Campbell spoke of those that were persecuted
for righteousness' sake, and in illustrating that drew a parallel
between the Jewish and Gentile dispensations; and also E
made a very important remark, that when people persecuted
for righteousness' sake they would not admit that it was for
righteousness' sake—and in illustration of that remark quoted
Isaiah lxvi. 5: Depones, that deponent was present at
the dispensation of the Lord's supper in Mr. Campbell's F
church in July, 1830: Depones, that on the Sabbath before
the communion Sabbath, Mr. Campbell, in preaching from
first Corinthians, eleventh chapter, in reference to the Lord's
Supper, and more particularly to the latter part of that chapter,
which has reference to the ordinance, Mr. Campbell distinct- G
ly stated that the self-examination of believers there mentioned
was not an examination whether they were believers—but
whether, being believers, they were approaching the ordinance
worthily, and in a right spirit, as seeing that that body had

A been broken, and that blood shed for themselves. That Mr. Campbell then also referred to 2d Corinthians xiii. 5, from which Mr. Campbell took occasion to state, that it did not refer to the examination whether a man was a believer or not—but referred to the particular state of the Corinthian B church at the time, which had made a demand upon the apostle, in the third verse, for a proof of Christ speaking in him; and that Mr. Campbell did not hold that a true believer could require self-examination in order to ascertain whether he was one or not—as that was a fact of which Mr. C Campbell thought a true believer could not be ignorant. Being interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell thereby to teach that a true believer could never be tempted to lose sight of the fact of his being a believer? Depones and answers, far from it; I would make the same D remark here as I did in reference to the assurance of faith; and add, that faith being the belief of a testimony, a man must know without any examination whether he is believing it or not.

Interrogated for the libellers: Depones, that he was pre- E sent when Mr. Campbell fenced the tables previously to the dispensation of the sacrament at Row, in July, 1830, and being interrogated whether, on that occasion, Mr. Campbell debarred from the Lord's Supper all who had not a personal assurance of their own salvation? Depones, that his impres- F sion was that as those alone could worthily partake of the ordinance who discerned the Lord's body therein, they could not do so worthily, who, in partaking of it, did not know that Christ had loved them, and given himself for them—which seemed to be in reference to the text of the action sermon. G Being interrogated whether he has understood Mr. Campbell to teach that in consequence of the death of Christ, the sins of every individual were pardoned, whether he believed it or not? Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that, in consequence of Christ's death, the forgiveness of sins

through his blood, was preached to every creature: by which A
the deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean, that personal guilt, during the day of grace, is not accounted of as debarring sinners from access to God, as a fountain of life, and that the work of Christ alone is sufficient to give the sinner confidence towards God as a father, to enable him to B
look with open face at the glory of God, and to serve him with the spirit of a child, instead of that of a slave. Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the forgiveness spoken of extended to every species and description of sin? Depones, that he understood Mr. C
Campbell to teach that this forgiveness was unlimited during the day of grace—but being designed by God to bring back the rebellious creature to himself, and to make him sympathize and share in his own righteous character, were this object not accomplished, the blood-shedding of the Lord D
Jesus Christ, so far from averting that wrath which is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness, shall give the power and efficacy to the judgment inflicted at the great day, when Christ shall render to every man according to the deeds done in his body. That the de- E
ponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the pardon of sin, already spoken of, included the sin of unbelief—because the unbelief itself might be considered the occasion of other sins. Being interrogated how he understood Mr. Campbell to reconcile the facts already deponed to that the sacrifice of F
the Lord Jesus Christ had procured pardon or forgiveness for all men, and that this pardon or forgiveness included the sin of unbelief, with the fact separately deponed to—that, during the day of grace, every repeated act of unbelief was forgiven? Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to G
teach, that at any time, during the day of grace, the sinner may be told that God was not imputing his trespasses to him, and that he might then come with as much confidence as at any given period, when he might have previously heard the

A gospel, and disbelieved it, during the whole of such intermediate period.

Depones, that he never understood Mr. Campbell to say that a believer might not be without assurance of salvation—but understood him to say that when a regenerate person B had not the assurance of faith, he was not believing God's testimony. Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that assurance is of the essence of faith, and necessary to salvation? Depones, that he certainly understood Mr. Campbell to teach—that the assurance of the C love of God to the individual was necessary to constitute saving faith.

Depones, that he has repeatedly heard Mr. Campbell pray for the forgiveness of sins. Being interrogated in what terms his prayer was conceived? Depones, that he never remarked D any thing peculiar in the terms—he used the words "Lord forgive us, and Lord forgive." Being interrogated what he understood Mr. Campbell to pray for in thus praying for the forgiveness of sins? Depones, that Mr. Campbell's prayer implied, at once, a confession of sin, and an acknow- E ledgment that sin was hateful to God, and that the thing sought for was not simply the removal of a judicial sentence, but the removal of an evil hateful in God's sight: Depones, that the prayer implied a belief of the present good-will of God by which separation is sought for, by the sinner, between F himself and that sin which is hateful to God; and deponent then added an illustration, which he remembered Mr. Campbell to have used on the subject, and which, after having first verbally stated to the court the substance of it as given by Mr. Campbell, the deponent, with permission of the court, G committed to writing, in their presence, from memory, upon a separate paper, which he now dictated to the clerk as follows, "He had heard Mr. Campbell, at a private exposition, state the consistency and beauty of the duty of those who know that their sins are forgiven them, in praying for

forgiveness. After stating that any objection that might be A
made to this duty, on the view of the forgiveness of sins
being *a past act for all,* was equally applicable to the di-
rection to believers so to pray—of whom it was acknow-
ledged, at all hands, that their sins were forgiven—and
adding that our Lord's prayer itself furnished an instance of B
those who knew God as their Father, asking the forgive-
ness of sin—he proceeded to make an illustration in some
such terms as the following: Let us suppose that a son
has for some time been away from his father's house, and has, in
profligacy and vice, acquired habits and manners quite the C
reverse of what his father might like, or approve. Let us
suppose that the young man, melted by undeserved kindness
from his father, has returned to his father's house, and can
now possibly entertain no doubt of his father's forgiveness,
and constant good-will towards him. Should it appear D
strange that, on any occasion, he, being conscious of some-
thing or many things in his manners that grieve his father,
should, at the very time that he has no doubt of his forgive-
ness and good-will, say, father forgive me—and that he
should even feel it his duty so to do, as expressing his own E
unworthiness, and the unmerited goodness of that parent
who is grieved by what he sees in him inconsistent with his
condition as the child of such a father."

Being interrogated by Dr. Graham—When Mr. Campbell
prayed for the forgiveness of sins in public worship, in re- F
ference to believers, did he ask a reversal of a judicial sen-
tence on the part of God, or the enjoyment of a sense of
the forgiving love of God? Depones and answers, that
deponent understood that Mr. Campbell, in praying for the
forgiveness of sin, in reference to believers, did not pray for G
the reversal of a judicial sentence, as if it were a repetition
of what the work of Christ has already accomplished—but
the removal of every thing which, through the power of sin
in the flesh, comes between the believer and the light of

A God's countenance: it implies a deprecation of that chastisement which God, as a father, inflicts upon his children, when they are not in the knowledge of their own unworthiness and God's love, and a recognition that God is faithful and just in forgiving their sins, and cleansing them from that
B unrighteousness which is a burden to them: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell pray for unbelievers, but never for the pardon of the sins of unbelievers—that the deponent has heard Mr. Campbell pray that God would overlook their long-continued rebellion and rejection of him, and that he
C would put forth strength to subdue their opposition, and cause them to give him glory. Being interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell meant by all men being redeemed from the curse of the law—was it from the judicial sentence of condemnation? Depones and answers, that
D by the work of Christ mankind were not under the law but under grace—understanding that it was now a righteous thing in God to receive any individual of that race without reference to the law he had broken, and that the sinner was as free to go to God, as his father, as if he had never violated
E that law, or that law had not existed. Being interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that mankind being now under the gospel, and their sins forgiven —that this forgiveness implies that in this life the judicial sentence is reversed? Depones and answers, that he
F did understand Mr. Campbell to teach that during the day of grace men's sins are not imputed to them, in order that they may have access to God with confidence—and that the judicial sentence of the law is reversed. Being interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell to
G teach, in reference to unbelievers, in a future state, the judicial sentence of the law would be executed against them? Depones and answers, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that unbelievers will be judged not according to the law but the gospel—that they will be condemned for

having despised a goodness which should have led them to repentance.

Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to exhort unbelievers, in his public discourses, to perform any duty? Depones and answers, that he exhorted them to believe the gospel—because unless a man believe the gospel he could not perform any duty acceptably to God. Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to exhort unbelievers to pray or repent? Depones, that deponent does not remember that Mr. Campbell ever exhorted unbelievers to pray, but certainly that he exhorted them to repent—and that Mr. Campbell often represented to unbelievers their awful condition while rejecting Christ. Being interrogated—Does deponent understand that Mr. Campbell has exhorted unbelievers to pray for an interest in Christ? Depones, that he recollects Mr. Campbell expressing his disapprobation of men praying for an interest in Christ—for without an interest in Christ he had no right to pray to God.

Interrogated by Dr. Hamilton—whether Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of faith, and the assurance of salvation, were the same thing? Depones, that the assurance of salvation did, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, arise out of the assurance of faith—by holding fast the beginning of our confidence to the end. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the assurance of salvation depended on the evidences of a regenerated state? Depones, that he has never heard Mr. Campbell speak on such a subject. Being interrogated what was that gospel which Mr. Campbell exhorted unbelievers to believe? Depones and answers, —it was that "God so loved the world," by which is meant every individual of the human race, "that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have eternal life."—That the record of God was, "that he hath given us eternal life, and that life was in his

A Son"—that so God had put life into a truth—that truth was the word of His gospel—that truth believed is life eternal to him.

Being interrogated, did Mr. Campbell teach that God has the same desire and will that all men should come to Christ,
B and believe on him? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that God has one honest desire and will that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved—which desire is frustrated in all except the elect, with regard to whom God's eternal purpose will not be
C defeated. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught was the nature of faith? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that faith was the belief of a testimony,—and that testimony is of God's holy love to the world, in giving his Son. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught if Christ
D redeemed all mankind alike? Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that Christ redeemed all mankind equally from the curse of the law—but those only who believe in Christ are redeemed from iniquity.

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot—whether Mr. Campbell
E taught that in the confession and acknowledgment of sin, the sin of unbelief was exclusively meant? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell meant by sin every manifestation of the flesh.

Interrogated by Mr. Story—what the witness understood
F Mr. Campbell to teach regarding the way in which a believer's confidence is held fast day by day unto the end? Depones and answers—that although the work itself be the work of the Spirit of God in the believer, yet, as consciously his own act, it is by continuing to believe what God has spoken, and
G beholding the glory of God as it shines in the face of Christ. Being interrogated whether he has heard Mr. Campbell connect the holding fast of the believer's confidence with such texts of Scripture, as for example, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling—Follow after holiness—

Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect?" Depones A
and answers, that he has never heard any preaching so forcibly and powerfully inculcating holiness—or stating so fully the provision for such holiness being in us. Being interrogated, whether he has heard Mr. Campbell use such expressions as the following, " I could not conceive any thing I B
would ask of God, which he has not told me that he has already given me?" Depones, that he does not remember Mr. Campbell making use of these words—but if they be referrible to any thing pertaining to life or godliness, he has heard Mr. Campbell use words of similar import: Depones, C
that deponent never heard Mr. Campbell teach that the only cause of sorrow in any man was not believing himself to be in a state of favour with God: Depones, that the only causes of sorrow which Mr. Campbell stated ought to be in believers, were sin in themselves, and sin in the world, as dishonouring D
God.

Re-interrogated by the defender.—Being interrogated, whether deponent ever heard Mr. Campbell directly teach or state any thing, from which deponent inferred that he held the existence of any desire or mind in God, that men should E
be saved independently of their coming to the knowledge of the truth? Depones and answers—never—Mr. Campbell never taught that God desired that men should be saved without their being made fit for the enjoyment of himself. Being interrogated, whether deponent ever heard Mr. Camp- F
bell teach that in any way, or at any time, God's judicial sentence or condemnation of sin, was done away or repealed? Depones and answers—never—the gospel is a greater manifestation than the law of God's condemnation of sin: Depones, that what Mr. Campbell taught concerning the conse- G
quences of God's not imputing sin to any man—was, that if God were imputing sin to men they could not be in the enjoyment of any one comfort at his hands; otherwise, as deponent understood him to teach, it would be a premium

upon iniquity, and a bounty upon sin. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men were by nature guilty before God? Depones and answers, certainly he did.

The witness being shewn the three volumes of sermons, Numbers one, two, and three, doquetted by the Moderator, and referred to in the libel, and interrogated whether these are the printed notes of Mr. Campbell's sermons, alluded to in a former part of his deposition? Depones and answers, that they are. And all this is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

(Signed) J. W. HAWKINS.

WILLIAM BONAR, Esq. Banker, St. Mary's parish, Edinburgh, aged about thirty-four years, unmarried, being solemnly sworn, examined, and purged of malice and partial counsel: Depones, that deponent has heard Mr. Campbell preach and expound during the year libelled: Depones, that deponent heard Mr. Campbell preach upon the fifth chapter of Matthew, verses first to twelfth, in his own church, at the visitation by the Presbytery, in July, 1830: Depones, that deponent thinks he heard Mr. Campbell treat both the doctrine of universal atonement, and that of assurance of faith, on that occasion: Depones, that deponent understood that the text led Mr. Campbell to treat these subjects—the characters which he described being those of true believers: Depones, that deponent rather thinks he has heard Mr. Campbell expound in Edinburgh between September 1829, and July, 1830, and he thinks it must have been more than once: Depones, that deponent was in Helensburgh during two Sundays, the one before, and the other after the visitation sermon, and he thinks he heard Mr. Campbell on both those occasions.

Being interrogated to what deponent understood Mr. Campbell on these occasions to ascribe the mission of the Son of God to this world? Depones and answers, "To the

love of God to the world." Being interrogated what Mr. A
Campbell taught was the manifestation of God's love to the
world? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught
that the love of God to the world was seen in the death of
Christ to put away the sins of the world: Depones, that
what deponent gives is his impression regarding the sub- B
stance of Mr. Campbell's teaching during the period libelled.
That except the three sermons above deponed to, the witness
has no recollection of particular dates. Being interrogated
where Mr. Campbell taught that God's hatred of sin was
chiefly to be seen? Depones and answers, in the death of his C
Son for the sins of the world. Being interrogated what Mr.
Campbell taught as to God's intention towards the world in
sending his Son to die for its sins? Depones and answers,
he taught that it was God's intention that the world should
be reconciled to him, and that men should be saved. Being D
interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to
mean in saying that Christ had put away the sins of the
world? Depones and answers, he taught that in consequence
of the death of Christ, as a sacrifice for the sins of the whole
world, God had done a work whereby he was righteous in E
not imputing sin to the world. Being interrogated what de-
ponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach in speaking of
God's intention that men should be saved? Depones and
answers, God's desire that men should be delivered from
the enmity of their hearts towards them. Being interrogated F
whether Mr. Campbell did or did not teach that putting
away of the sins of the world by Christ's death did of itself
deliver men from the enmity of their hearts towards God?
Depones and answers, that deponent did understand Mr.
Campbell to teach so—that it does put away the enmity of G
the heart *when believed.* Being interrogated whether Mr.
Campbell taught that it did so when not believed? Depones
and answers, he did not.

Being interrogated whether deponent heard Mr. Campbell

A teach regarding the power by which a man believes it? Depones and answers, I think so, by the power of the Holy Spirit. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught regarding the relation between the putting away of sin in Christ's death and judgment to come? Depones and answers,
B I always understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the putting away of sin presupposed judgment to come. Being interrogated on whom Mr. Campbell taught that that judgment was to come? Depones and answers, on all men without exception. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught con-
C cerning those who believe not, in reference to that judgment? Depones and answers, he taught in reference to them who believe not, that in that day they shall be condemned because they believed not the love of God. Being interrogated whether he heard Mr. Campbell teach the relation between that
D condemnation for unbelief and the evil deeds of men? Depones and answers, I always understood that he taught a distinct relation between the two. Being interrogated what was the relation so taught? Depones and answers, it was that the evil deeds of men arise from their not believing in
E the love of God. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught that this unbelief arose from? Depones and answers, from their evil heart of unbelief—from their being unwilling to believe the love of God—that by nature every man was in that state of unwillingness. Being interrogated whether Mr.
F Campbell, in teaching regarding the non-imputation of sin, included all sins? Depones and answers, that God was not imputing any sin to any man in the world. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught in that matter regarding the sin of unbelief? Depones and answers, I understood him to
G teach that unbelief was a state or character—but that sins of unbelief are those sins that are forgiven. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding the relation towards God into which the creature came by having his sins put away in the death of Christ? Depones and answers, he

taught the relation to be, that there was then no barrier in A
the way preventing the creature from rejoicing in God as
his God. Being interrogated whether or not deponent un-
derstood the removal of that barrier to be what Mr. Camp-
bell taught as constituting the pardon or forgiveness of sin?
Depones and answers, I did. Being interrogated whether B
Mr. Campbell ever taught regarding the redemption of all
men by Christ? Depones and answers, yes—that all men
were redeemed by the blood of Christ. Being interrogated
what Mr. Campbell taught regarding the consequent relation
between all men and Christ? Depones and answers, that C
Christ, because of his work and righteousness, was made
head over all—and that from his being so, men were in that
state in which God was not imputing sin to them. That in
consequence of this work of redemption Christ had been
made Judge over all, and all judgment had been committed D
to him. That the redemption of all men, thus effected by
Christ, was certainly not a redemption from his judgment
Being interrogated whether in teaching regarding this re-
demption of all men by Christ, and the putting away of the
sins of all men in the death of Christ, Mr. Campbell taught E
that God had so put away his own condemnation of sin?
Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that he
had not put away his condemnation of sin. Being interro-
gated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding the test, or rule
of judgment, by which Christ would try men at his judg- F
ment? Depones and answers, he taught that it was their love
to himself.

Being interrogated whether the deponent heard Mr.
Campbell teach regarding the source, root, or principle of all
acceptable obedience to God? Depones and answers, I G
think I have—that that root was love to himself. Being
interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught regarding the possi-
bility of unbelievers obeying God? Depones and answers,
he taught that it was impossible. Being interrogated what

A Mr. Campbell taught regarding the obligation of unbelievers to obey God? Depones and answers, he taught that they were under that obligation. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers were or were not guilty before God? Depones and answers, he taught that B they were guilty in not believing and loving God.

Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell, in his preaching, expounding, or prayers, said any thing regarding the confession of sin? Depones and answers, I have heard Mr. Campbell confess sin. Being interrogated whether he heard C Mr. Campbell pray for the forgiveness of sin? Depones and answers, I have.

Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught regarding the interest of men in Christ? Depones and answers, I understand him to say, that all men have an interest in D Christ. Being interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean in saying so? Depones and answers, that Christ died for their sins, and that, in consequence, God was not imputing sin to them.

Being interrogated whether deponent has heard Mr. Camp- E bell teach regarding assurance? Depones and answers, yes, regarding the assurance of faith, and also the assurance of salvation. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell expressed in using the words, assurance of faith? Depones and answers, the assurance of God's love to the individual believer. F Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell expressed by the assurance of salvation? Depones and answers, "the consciousness of being, individually, in a state of reconciliation, and peace with God." Being interrogated whether deponent heard Mr. Campbell state a connexion between these two, G and if so, what was the connexion so stated? Depones and answers, he stated that it was impossible for a man to have the assurance of God's love to himself, individually, without the consciousness of being in a state of salvation. Being interrogated whether or not deponent understood Mr. Camp-

bell, in so speaking, to state or imply that a regenerate man could be at any time without the assurance of salvation? Depones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught, that as that assurance depended on a man's believing, it was only whilst a man believed that he possessed that assurance, and he might not always be believing.

Being interrogated whether deponent ever heard Mr. Campbell call men to repentance? Depones and answers, yes, I have heard him press repentance upon men. Being interrogated by what arguments Mr. Campbell pressed repentance upon men? Depones and answers, he did so by representing sin as an evil thing, offensive to God, and as sinning against the love of God, who had blotted out, or put away their sins. Being interrogated what relation Mr. Campbell taught to exist between repentance and the judgment to come? Depones and answers, that he taught that in repenting, men came into that state in which they were prepared to meet that judgment. Being interrogated whether deponent, in hearing Mr. Campbell, did or did not understand the view given by him of the love of God to all men, as calculated to leave men easy in sin?

Objected to on the part of the libellers, that the question is incompetent, as involving a mere matter of opinion on the part of the witness. To which it was answered, on the part of the defender, that the question was put to the witness in order to meet, by its answer, evidence already on record—and, in particular, an observation appended by Dr. Burns, to an answer given by him when cross-interrogated for the defender; and that although no such contrary evidence had existed on record, the question as put was in itself perfectly competent, being not an appeal to the opinion of the witness, but a question, in point of fact, as to the effect produced in the mind of the hearer at the time when Mr. Campbell spoke. The Presbytery repelled the objection, and allowed the question to be put. From which, finding Dr. Fleming

A dissented and protested, for leave to complain to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, on the ground that the question refers to the opinion, and not to the evidence of the witness, and that it is incompetent and irregular, as well as highly inexpedient, to load the record with matter that cannot be consid-
B ered as testimony—and took instruments and craved extracts. To which dissent and complaint, Messrs. Jaffray, Carr, Sym, and Lochore, adhered.

And the question being put: Depones and answers, that deponent understood that the view of the love of God
C given by Mr. Campbell, was directly calculated to produce holiness, as being the only view of the character of God, by which a man can come to be at peace with him. Being interrogated whether or not Mr. Campbell taught that the non-imputation of sin to the world, by the death of Christ,
D was eternal? Depones, that deponent does not recollect Mr. Campbell to have expressed himself so—but that deponent understood him to teach that it implied a full forgiveness to every man, of all his sins, during this life. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell did or did not teach that the
E Holy Spirit was *in* every man? Depones, that Mr. Campbell did not teach so—but taught that he was in Christ Jesus *for* every man. Being interrogated whether or not Mr. Campbell taught that all men had the life of Christ? Depones and answers—that he taught that no man had the life
F of Christ in him, until he believed. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that all men were in Christ? Depones and answers, that he does not recollect Mr. Campbell to have said so—but to have taught that Christ was head over all men, and that through him the blessing of
G God's forgiving love had come upon them, and that in that sense they were in Christ. Being interrogated whether deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that all men were members of the body, of which Christ was the head? Depones, I did not. Being interrogated whether Mr. Camp-

bell taught that God had joy over all men, or only over A
believers? Depones and answers, that he understood him to
teach that God had joy only over believers—that others
were rejecting his love—and that he grieved over them while
in that state.

Interrogated for the libellers, whether Mr. Campbell, in his B
sermon, preached before the Presbytery, taught any thing re-
garding the character of peacemaker, in reference to Christ
having died for every human being? Depones, that he did:
That he taught that he alone had the character of peacemaker,
who was in a state of reconciliation with God; and that he C
alone had the character of peacemaker who believed the love
of God to himself personally. Being interrogated, depones,
that Mr. Campbell taught, in the same sermon, that the love
of God to every man was to be measured by the sufferings
of Christ. And being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell D
taught that it was an indispensable feature, in the character
of a Christian, that he should know that God has had mercy
on him, and has forgiven him? Depones and answers, that
this is what he understood to be the substance of what Mr.
Campbell taught within the period libelled. Being interro- E
gated what he understood Mr. Campbell to have prayed for
when he prayed, as formerly deponed, for the forgiveness of
sins? Depones and answers, that the forgiveness of sin taught
by Mr. Campbell, being the non-imputation of sin, in conse-
quence of a work done for the sinner, by Christ Jesus—those F
who understand this view of forgiveness, having, through it,
learned to hate the sin thus forgiven, are, in praying for the
forgiveness of sin, confessing sin as an evil thing in the sight
of God—repenting of the sin thus committed against a God,
who had thus forgiven them, and deprecating the visitations G
of their Father, because of having so sinned. The witness
would also add, that, in such a prayer, there is a prayer for
grace to cease from sowing to the flesh: Depones, that in
stating the above answer, the deponent means to express his

A understanding of what Mr. Campbell prayed for, when he prayed for the forgiveness of sins.

Re-interrogated for the defender: what he understood Mr. Campbell to mean in deprecating the fatherly visitations of God for sin? Depones and answers, temporal afflictions—
B by which deponent means, afflictions in this life—chastenings from God.

Interrogated by Dr. Hamilton: What blessings did Mr. Campbell teach were derived from the love of God, when it is known and believed? Depones and answers, that when
C that love is believed, the man so enters into peace—becomes a member of the body of Christ—and so has eternal life. Interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach was the cause of the sin and misery of those who do not understand and believe the love of God? Depones and answers, an evil heart of un-
D belief. Being interrogated, what did Mr. Campbell teach is the cause of the ruin of those who perish? Depones and answers, their ignorance of God, from a wilful unbelief of his love.

Interrogated by Mr. Proudfoot, whether Mr. Campbell
E stated, that in the day of judgment men shall be condemned, because they believed not the love of God, as extending to men universally? Depones and answers, that the deponent understood Mr. Campbell taught that unbelievers will be condemned in the day of judgment, because of not believing the
F love of God to themselves. Being interrogated what he understood Mr. Campbell to teach when he said, sin was imputed to no man in this life? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Campbell to teach that every man's sins are fully and freely forgiven: Interrogated, whether such forgiveness
G is limited to the present life? Depones and answers, it is a full forgiveness, and is never recalled.

Interrogated by Mr. Story: Whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that these sins are ever to be called to remembrance? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Camp-

bell to teach, that God will bring every work into judgment, A
whether it be good or evil. Being interrogated what he understood Mr. Campbell to teach regarding the influence which the fact of their forgiveness would have upon men's future punishment? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that the fact of the forgiveness of sin, as mani- B
festing the love of God to the sinner, would be the ground of his condemnation, as not having believed the love of God. Being interrogated: depones, that the rejection of this forgiveness is the aggravation of their guilt. Being interrogated: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, C
that a sinner discovers the love of God to himself, in the manifestation of the love of God to the world, by the death of his Son: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that belief, or faith, is the only way by which a sinner can be made holy: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to D
teach, that a sinner could not enjoy salvation while he continued in his sins, and that God abhorred sin in his people, as well as in unbelievers. And being interrogated, whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that the belief of the fact, of a man's being individually reconciled to God, constituted E
the faith of the gospel? Depones and answers, that the belief of that fact, understanding it as the putting away of his own sins, was, according to Mr. Campbell's teaching, the faith of the gospel. Being interrogated in what way he understood Mr. Campbell to teach this reconciliation was effectual? De- F
pones and answers, that Mr. Campbell taught that the way of reconciliation was the manifestation of God's character to sinners, through the death of his Son, as a ground of confidence for every sinner to trust in him. Being interrogated, Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that the G
believing contemplation of the work of Christ was inseparably connected with the knowledge of our being reconciled, and that this knowledge of the work of Christ preceded our personal reconciliation—understanding by that, our being

A personally at peace with God: Depones, that he understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that the way in which that knowledge produced holiness was, by producing in the sinner, love to God, and, therefore, an abhorrence of every thing opposed to his will.

B Interrogated by Dr. Fleming: Whether he recollects the texts on which he heard Mr. Campbell preach as before deponed? Depones and answers, that he does not recollect the texts from which Mr. Campbell preached on the Sabbath before, and the Sabbath after the visitation sermon: Depones,

C that deponent has repeatedly heard Mr. Campbell lecture in Edinburgh, in the course of the period libelled: Depones, that he does not recollect the precise expressions used by Mr. Campbell—but has given what he understands the substance of his teaching: Depones, that the deponent does not

D recollect Mr. Campbell praying for deliverance from wrath to come: Depones, that Mr. Campbell confessed sins in his prayers, both generally and specially. Being interrogated, whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that assurance of God's love to a man personally was essential to faith?

E Depones and answers in the affirmative—and that this assurance was essential to salvation: Depones, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach that believers are continually falling into sin, and committing all varieties of sins, or acts of disobedience to, and resistance of the will of God: De-

F pones, that Mr. Campbell, in calling men to repentance, urged men to repent of the state of unbelief and enmity against God in which they were, and in which they were continually sinning, and to repent of all their sins. Being interrogated whether he understood Mr. Campbell to teach that a sinner is

G condemned solely for his unbelief, or for his other sins also? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Campbell to have taught that a sinner is condemned because he is found unrighteous; and that he is found so, because of his not having believed the love of God: Depones, that deponent under-

stood Mr. Campbell to mean by "the life of Christ in a man" A
the having eternal life.

Re-interrogated by the defender: Depones, that Mr. Campbell taught that all men had their evil and corrupt natures by descent from Adam. Being interrogated whether Mr. Campbell taught that a man who saw the love of God to B
himself, but did not see the love of God to the whole world, was or was not a believer? Depones and answers, I understood Mr. Campbell to teach that a man who saw the love of God to himself was a believer. Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that the judgment to come was to C
be executed by the Father or by the Son? Depones and answers, by the Son. Being interrogated what Mr. Campbell taught to be God's object in bringing every work, good or evil, to light in the day of judgment? Depones and answers, to manifest the righteousness of that judgment. D
Being interrogated, whether Mr. Campbell taught that a man, believing the forgiveness of sin without knowing the character of God, believed unto salvation? Depones and answers, he taught that that man only who saw the character of God in the forgiveness was saved: Depones, that deponent never E
recollects Mr. Campbell to have taught that a man could believe the forgiveness of his sin without knowing the character of God. Being interrogated whether the deponent understood Mr. Campbell, in speaking of believing in this forgiveness of sins, to mean the belief in a historical fact, or F
the understanding of a truth? Depones and answers, the understanding of a truth—the receiving of the love of God into the heart. Being interrogated what deponent understood Mr. Campbell to mean by the character of God, the knowledge of which is inseparable from belief in the forgive- G
ness of sins? Depones and answers, that deponent understood Mr. Campbell to teach, that the character of God seen in the forgiveness of sins is love to the sinner who believes that doctrine.

GENERAL BOOKBINDING CO.
80 206NY2 10 045 A ADH. 6018
QUALITY CONTROL MARK

DATE DUE

HIGHSMITH # 45220

BW5546 .C2C2
The whole proceedings before the
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00038 5924